A CONTINUATION of the

DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

A Christian and a Quaker:

WHEREIN

The truth of those things objected against them in the first part, are fully confirm'd:

TOGETHER

With a further account of their perilous and pernitious Errors

CONCERNING.

The Person of Christ, His Satisfaction: Justification, Sanctification: The ministry, and Immediate Motions

Are in this Second PART

Cleerly and plainly represented out of the Writings of some of their Principal, and most Approved Leaders.

Published for the Common Information of such as either really are, or may be, in danger of being Insnared and intangled by them.

By *Thomas Hicks.*

Tit. 1. 10, 11. *For there are many unruly, and vain talkers, and deceivers, whose mouthes must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre sake.*
2 Tim. 3. 9. *But they shall proceed no further, for their folly shall be made manifest to all men——*

LONDON,
Printed, for *Peter Parker*, at the *Leg* and *Star* in *Cornhill*, over against the *Royal Exchange*, 1673.

The Epiſtle to the Reader.

Reader,

Atan's great deſign againſt Religion is manag'd, and carryed on, partly by error, and partly by perſecution: by that, he inſtills ſuch notions into the minds of men as may teach them to deny it; by this, he would affright and terrifie them from it. The miſcheifs he hath wrought by the former; the age where into our lot is faln, gives us, but too many inſtances.

The people with whom I have to deal, though they are leaſt concerned with, yet pretend to the greateſt intereſt in the truth: who being not ſatisfied with thoſe wayes, and methods, God hath reveal'd, and preſcribed in the holy Scriptures, have broken all bounds, caſt off the yoak, the known rule; and follow only ſuch impulſes, and motions, as hath been given in from him, who deſigns nothing ſhort of their ruine, by ſuch ſtrategems: which are ſo much the more malignant, and effectual towards his intended end, by how much they are more grateful to that proud opinion they have of themſelves.

Some account of their perillous opinions in, and about ſeveral important points of the Chriſtian Faith, hath heretofore been given unto you: unto which, I have long been threatned with a ſolid Anſwer, though as yet I have not ſeen any: that peice of impertinency, which *G. Whitehead* hath ſent abroad into the World, I ſuppoſe (though not ſo call'd, yet) in-

tended for an answer, wherein, I am rather vindicated, then answered; most of all the material things in difference, he passeth by in silence.

I have, in this second part, presented you with a more full relation of their dangerous Tenets, wherein the truth of my former Allegations against them, are (from their own mouths) fully established, and all Objections that hitherto have occur'd to my knowledge, are taken notice of: all which, I shall leave to thy serious Judgment.

Many of the things objected against them, are so horrid, that 'tis probable some will not believe them culpable; God forbid, that I should be guilty of such vile injustice, as to charge them with false things: examine the quotations, and then judge. As for those instances that are not in print, I have such undoubted evidences of their truth, as may satisfie any man.

From the whole thou may'st be inform'd that the Quakers Christ, and way of Salvation, is Forreign to what is revealed in the Scriptures. The Doctrines delivered by them are such, as neither themselves, nor any for them, can give us a distinct & intelligible account of. The tendency of all their writings, and declarings, doth but lead people into the thickets of absurd, inexplicable, and unintelligible Dotages.

They amuze us with the great words of *Life and Power*, pretend as if they lived under the immediate Influences, though alas, such is their unhappiness, *they embrace a cloud, feed on ashes, and know not that a lye is in their right hand*, and (which is the more astonishing) many people (not distinguishing between words and things, pretences and reall injoyments) are so easily entrapped and deceived by them: but what shall we say, If God for the wantonness of persons,

sons, under the means of Light, *should give them up to a reprobate sense, to strong delusions to believe lyes, (to follow and admire, such monsters in Religion) that they may be damned, because they received not the Truth in the love of it*, hence when I consider, that God, to glorifie his Justice in punishing the wickedness of men, doth permit the Enemy to distract their minds, and to set them on madding after they know not what, on purpose to divert them from those things, which are of immediate concernment to them, I say, the consideration hereof lessens my wonder, when I see such delusions, and impostures prevail. Though to see a people under the Immediate Judgment of God, fancying themselves to be the non-such of the World, for priviledges, and injoyments, is (I confesse) matter of deep Lamentation, and Pity.

Twill be therefore our interest, and Wisdome, to consider (before it be too late) both what we do, and who, and what we believe We are hastning towards Eternity. To miscarry about our last end will not only be unhappy, but it will prove the utmost complement of our unhappiness. By nature we are all sinners, and stand guilty before God; if we be unprovided of a meet Righteousness wherewith to appear before the great Tribunal, it will be of perilous consequence. That a compleat Righteousness should be spun out of our own bowells (our lapsd condition considerd) is impossible.

That Jesus Christ in his Mediatory undertakings for sinners should be improved by us, is apparently denyd by these Quakers; so that all mankind are left (according to their principles) under a fatal necessity of perishing. For, if the way and means, which God's infinite Wisdom, & Will, hath constituted, in order to mans eternal welfare, be rejected; in vain will it be for

tended for an answer, wherein, I am rather vindicated, then answered; most of all the material things in difference, he passeth by in silence.

I have, in this second part, presented you with a more full relation of their dangerous Tenets, wherein the truth of my former Allegations against them, are (from their own mouths) fully established, and all Objections that hitherto have occur'd to my knowledge, are taken notice of: all which, I shall leave to thy serious Judgment.

Many of the things objected against them, are so horrid, that tis probable some will not believe them culpable; God forbid, that I should be guilty of such vile injustice, as to charge them with false things: examine the quotations, and then judge. As for those instances that are not in print, I have such undoubted evidences of their truth, as may satisfie any man.

From the whole thou mayst be inform'd that the Quakers Christ, and way of Salvation, is Forreign to what is revealed in the Scriptures. The Doctrines delivered by them are such, as neither themselves, nor any for them, can give us a distinct & intelligible account of. The tendency of all their writings, and declarings, doth but lead people into the thickets of absurd, Inexplicable, and unintelligible Dotages.

They amuze us with the great words of *Life and Power*, pretend as if they lived under the immediate Influences, though alas, such is their unhappiness, *they embrace a cloud, feed on ashes, and know not that a lye is in their right hand*, and (which is the more astonishing) many people (not distinguishing between words and things, pretences and reall injoyments) are so easily entrapped and deceived by them: but what shall we say, If God for the wantonness of persons,

sons, under the means of Light, *should give them up to a reprobate sense, to strong delusions to believe lyes, (to follow and admire, such monsters in Religion) that they may be damned, because they received not the Truth in the love of it*, hence when I consider, that God, to glorifie his Justice in punishing the wickedness of men, doth permit the Enemy to distract their minds, and to set them on madding after they know not what, on purpose to divert them from those things, which are of immediate concernment to them, I say, the consideration hereof lessens my wonder, when I see such delusions, and impostures prevail. Though to see a people under the Immediate Judgment of God, fancying themselves to be the non-such of the World, for priviledges, and injoyments, is (I confesse) matter of deep Lamentation, and Pity.

'Twill be therefore our interest, and Wisdome, to consider (before it be too late) both what we do, and who, and what we believe. We are hastning towards Eternity. To miscarry about our last end will not only be unhappy, but it will prove the utmost complement of our unhappiness. By nature we are all sinners, and stand guilty before God; if we be unprovided of a meet Righteousness wherewith to appear before the great Tribunal, it will be of perilous consequence. That a compleat Righteousness should be spun out of our own bowells (our lapsed condition considered) is impossible.

That Jesus Christ in his Mediatory undertakings for sinners should be improved by us, is apparently deny'd by these Quakers; so that all mankind are left (according to their principles) under a fatal necessity of perishing. For, if the way and means, which God's infinite Wisdom, & Will, hath constituted, in order to mans eternal welfare, be rejected; in what will it be for

us

us to think of another. That thus it is, with these People, the ensuing Dialogue will give you sufficient grounds to conclude.

The person of Christ they plainly deny, and positively affirm *That the Doctrine of rejoycing, and acceptance from the works of another is utterly excluded,* W. Pen. Sa. Foun. p. 27. And that *God accepts not any, in whom there is any failing, who do not fulfill the Law and answer every demand of Justice.* And when they talk of the blood of Christ, they delude their hearers or readers. *For, by that blood they mean nothing but the Life and Light within.* At the same instant they are pleading for Perfection, they will discharge you from duty, except you be immediatly moved thereunto, as if their perfection consisted in being stocks and stones, or, which is worse, in being rebels against the Law of God. Their discourse (for the most part) is about the Light within, yet the Light is not more contrary to Darkness, than their Dictates are about this thing. What one of them saith, another of their own will contradict. What one man at one time affirms, he himself will deny at another. One while 'tis the Divine essence, 'tis Christ, tis increated; another while, 'tis not Christ himself, but only his gift, or appearance, a seed, a measure of Light, a witness for God. Now, 'tis the only Saviour, and rule; anon we hear of another that both saves it, and rules it. Their sayings hereabouts are so cross and thwarting, that 'tis almost impossible for a man to know when they speak as they think, or think as they speak.

That every man hath a Light in him, is not denyed: for, had he not a Light, he were not capable of being govern'd by a rule: But that this, which renders him capable of walking by rule, should be it self the rule, is not intelligible.

The

The holy Scriptures are esteemed (by them) inferior to their own pamphlets; yea they render them to be of no more Authority than the Fables of *Esop*.

Hence they substitute in its room, their own motions, and impulses, and yet (if you will believe them, when they dissemble) they will tell you, they own the Scriptures. Their own people know not their intrigues nor the designs they have upon them, they do not use to trust (as some of them have said) such, (that is their ordinary followers) with their opinions, and yet to secure their people to them, they will possess them with greatest prejudices imaginable against any that seriously endeavour to recover them, out of their snare, still perswading them to the highest veneration of the Quakers Ministry, and that whatever is suggested against them, (tho' never so true) must be looked upon as the greatest lye. They hate the Light, whilst they pretend to it: if you discourse with them, 'tis not the argument but the man, they will cheifly be concern'd with; upon whom, can they but fix any thing that is odious, it shall pass both for an answer, and a confutation, and to fill up their wickedness, they will, (in their solemn way, and manner of profaneſs and blasphemy) bless God, that they have thus answer'd.

Observe them in their families, the irreligious education of their Children, the ordinary neglect of all Christian duties, and also their common converse, and what can we see in them, to represent them to be what they pretend? They will boast of mortification, yet love their backs and bellies to excesse, that what will please their betters, will not content them, and yet so infatuated are they, as to conclude themselves, to be a perfect and self-denying people.

The Lord in mercy vouchsafe to us in this hour of tryal,

tryal, wherein the Spirit of error doth ſo fearfully prevail) that his holy truth may ſhine out, to preſerve us from theſe paths of the Deſtroyer, and if it may pleaſe him, to manifeſt, and magnify his Soveraign mercy and Grace in the pardon, and recovery of theſe deluding, and deluded creatures, and grant unto us ſuch an underſtanding of his holy will reveal'd to us, that we may diſcern truth from error; that though Errors and Hereſies do appear and ſhew themſelves, yet we may approve our ſelves ſincere, in a ſerious contending for, and adhering to, the Truth once deliyered to the Saints.

Thomas Hicks.

A FARTHER

ACCOUNT

OF THE

Dangerous Opinions

OF THE

QUAKERS:

COLLECTED

Out of the Writings of ſeveral of their Principal Leaders, faithfully repreſented in the enſuing Dialogue between a Chriſtian *and a* Quaker.

Chr. I Have formerly detected you of ſeveral Pernicious Opinions concerning the Scriptures, the Light within, the Perſon of Chriſt, and the Reſurrection of the Dead, &c. which, I preſume, by this time you have conſider'd; What ſay you thereunto?

Quak. *I ſay the Plagues and Judgments of God will follow thee,* G. Whitehead.

Chr. Though your Conſcience might be

touch'd with the evidence of the things alledg'd againſt you, yet it would have been your prudence rather to have diſſembled your Pain, then thus to vent your Paſſion in ſuch furious Replies: But you muſt not think to baffle me with ſuch Sarcaſms, either confeſs the truth of what you are charged with, or elſe diſprove it.

Quak. *I have in print told thee, That thy Dialogue is an unchriſtian forgery*, G. Whitehead, D. Plungd. *Title Page.*

Chr. Wherein haſt thou proved it ſo to be?

Quak. *Thou haſt preſented the World with a Quaker of thy own forming, making them to ſpeak thoſe impertinencies and falſhoods that were never utter'd by any real Quaker; therefore 'tis a forgery*, G. W. *Epiſtle to* D. Pl.

Chr. You had done well, if you had produced ſome inſtances wherein I made them ſpeak what was never utter'd by a real Quaker. But if I can prove that what is ſpoken under that name, is the language of a real Quaker, then thou haſt confeſs'd that ſuch may be guilty of Impertinencies and Falſhoods.

Quak. *That thou canſt never prove, for I affirm, That the Quaker there repreſented to the World is of thy own making.*

Chr. I wonder that you who pretend ſo much to circumſpection in your Words, ſhould yet be ſo extravagant in Print; 'Tis notorious, the Dialogue mentions ſeveral that are, and were, approved Quakers, (viz.) *G. Whitehead, G. Fox, James Naylor, Criſp, Richard Hubberthrone*, and *Ben. Furley*, &c. If theſe be not, or were not real Quakers, then do you publickly deny it; or if thoſe things quoted

quoted of them be not true, disprove them: But if that cannot be deny'd, nor this disproved, how dare you say, I have presented the World with a Quaker of my own making?

Quak. *I say thy Dialogue is no other then unchristian forgery.*

Chr. That obligeth thee to prove it, which as yet thou hast not done.

Quak. *Have I not instanc'd in several particulars wherein thou hast wronged us*, Dip. Pl. p. 16, 17.

Chr. Are those the onely things wherein the forgery consists?

Quak. *What sayst thou to them?*

Chr. I tax'd *G. Whitehead*, For affirming *the light within to be God*; And for saying, *That the speaking of the Spirit in any is of greater authority then the Scriptures*; and also for denying *the resurrection of this Body*, &c. *Crisp*, for saying, *He knew the beginning and date of that Christ I believed in*; *G. Fox*, for asserting, *The Soul to be part of God's Being, to be without beginning, and infinite*: *Ben. Furly*, for saying, 'Tis *the greatest error in the World that ever was invented, and the ground of all error, To say the Scriptures are a Rule to Christians*: *G. Fox* and *Rich. Hubberthorne* for affirming, That it is dangerous for ignorant people to read the Scriptures, &c. *G. Whitehead*'s silence herein, is in my judgment a plain confession touching the verity of these Quotations, which is a manifest giving away your Cause; nevertheless, if there be any thing wherein you judge your selves wrong'd, let me hear it.

Quak. *Thou sayst we account the blood of Christ no more then a common thing; yea, no more then the*

blood of a common Thief, this is forgery.

Chr. If the meer light within, and obedience to it, be every way sufficient to bring every man to eternal life, as you constantly affirm, then the shedding of Christ's blood upou the Cross was needless, and to no purpose. *Isaac Pennington* (who I suppose is an approved Quaker) asks this question, Can outward blood cleanse? Therefore, saith he, We must enquire whether it was the blood of the Vail, *that is of the humane nature*, or the blood within the Vail, (viz.) *of that spiritual man, consisting of Flesh, Blood, and Bones, which took on him the Vail, or humane Nature?* 'Tis not the blood of the Vail, that is but outward; and can outward blood cleanse? if not, then that blood which Christ shed upon the Cross, which was the blood of the Humane Nature, is no more then a common thing.

Secondly, If the sufferings of Christ were only exemplary, as you likewise affirm, then what more do you attribute to the blood of Christ, then to the blood and sufferings of other holy persons?

Thirdly, If the *mystery of Iniquity lies in the blood of Christ*, as Edw. Billing most wickedly said it did, then is the blood of Christ, in your esteem, worse then the blood of a common Thief: Farther, what signifies these words which frequently drop from your mouths, *Dost thou look at Christs Death afar off? what will that Blood avail? Didst ever see any of it? That carnal blood, can outward blood cleanse? If thou hadst a great deal of it, would it do thee any good?* Do not these Interrogatories carry with them an open scorn and contempt of that blood which was shed upon the Cross? consequently that which is charged upon you is no forgery.

Quak.

Quak. *Thou sayst we make use of Scripture onely to stop their mouths who call for Scripture proof; this is a Slander.*

Chr. If the Scriptures be no Rule; yea, if it be Idolatry to call the Bible a means, as *Whitehead expresly sayes it is, D. P. pag.* 13. Who also affirms, *That faith grounded on the Scriptures is but an empty Implicit Faith, and be-speaks such persons void of the Knowledge of God, Christ, Salvation, and to be yet in their Sins, and that such men walk by their own Fancies and Imaginations.* Christ ascended, *p.* 11. *Solo Eccles.* (a great admirer of *George Fox*) discoursing with a Friend of mine in *London*, told him, The Scriptures were a lye; To whom 'twas replyed, Why then dost thou mention them? The Quaker answer'd, To silence thee.

Nicolas Lucas, a real Quaker, was moved to declare his mind thus, (to one I know very well) *Thou mayst burn thy Bible, and when that is done, thou mayst serve God as well without it; and if thou hast a mind to have a Scripture, thou mayst write as good a one thy self.* Many more instances might be produced, these may suffice to acquit me from forgery in this particular; what more hast thou to say?

Quak. *Thou sayst that* Fox, Dewsberry, Crisp, Whitehead, *and* Pen, *are exceedingly corrupt in their Morals, herein thou hast spoken falsly.*

Chr. Hast thou bid adieu to common honesty? art thou endeavouring to prove me a Forgerer, and yet at the same time be guilty of it thy self? *See the Dialogue p.* 43. which saith, Some of them are exceedingly corrupt in their Morals. If you think it your interest to put me on the proof here-

of, you may when you please, and I doubt not (if well) but to give you full satisfaction herein, provided that *wilful lying, fornication, and adultery may be accounted Immoralities*; what further hast thou to alledge against me?

Quak. *Thou reports that the Quakers deny the resurrection of the Body, which is false.*

Chr. George Whitehead, in my hearing, before near a hundred Witnesses, did deny it, in these words, *This Body of flesh and bones shall not rise again*; who also saith enough in his Pamphlet to acquit me from forgery herein.

Quak. *Thou insinuates, as if our sufferings were onely to satisfie our Wills and Lusts; herein thou dost greatly wrong us.*

Chr. In this I onely queried what it should be that doth influence you to suffer, forasmuch as you deny that this Body shall rise from the dead, and consequently can be never the better for what you do or suffer. And *G. Fox* maintains, That the Soul is part of Gods Being, &c. and therefore not capable either of prejudice or advantage, whether you suffer or not. Again, is there any people that ever boasted so vainly of their Sufferings as you do, that scarce a Pamphlet can come out from you, but the World must hear of your brags in this kind; which can have no other meaning, then to feed that Principle of Pride that reigns in you, and to gain Proselites to your errors, &c.

Quak. *Thou also sayst, We deny any eternal advantage to be reaped by persons after death; In this thou dost abuse us.*

Chr. This is no other then the genuine and direct

direct conſequence of denying the reſurrection of this Body. See 1 Cor. 15. 13, 14. *If no reſurrection, then is not Chriſt riſen: If Chriſt be not riſen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith vain. and ye are yet in your Sins*, ver. 17. *Why ſtand I in jeopardy every hour?* ver. 30. *What advantageth me that I have fought with Beaſts at* Epheſus? *Let us eat and drink, for to morrow we dye*, ver. 32.

If we ask you whether a further happineſs (*then now*) ſhall be injoy'd by the Saints at the laſt day, you will anſwer by another queſtion. *When thinks thou that will be? muſt all the Saints have their hope and faith unanſwer'd till then*, Whitehead *Chriſt aſcended*, p. 34. If we inquire whether you do not wait for any thing further? you will tell us, *That Death and Darkneſs hath power over our Minds, elſe we would never ſhew our ſelves ſuch ignorant Papiſts, in putting Salvation ſo far off, till we know not when, according to our carnal conceits*, Whitehead, ibid. If hereupon we ask you, Whether you injoy eternal life and felicity now? This is your anſwer, *The recompence of reward*, (viz.) *eternal life and felicity is inwardly and ſpiritually received by thoſe that now ſuffer for Chriſt*, Whitehead, ibid. p. 37.

I ſuppoſe by this time thou art, at leaſt may be ſatisfied, that in theſe inſtances I was not guilty of forgery, and conſequently *Geo. Whitehead's* pretended anſwer to me carries a manifeſt lye in the front of it, as any may perceive, who compares it with the Dialogue.

Quak. *I ſay thy Dialogue is proved an unchriſtian forgery.*

Chr. It was inconſiderately and imprudently

done by thee to put ſuch words in thy very Title Page, ſince there is nothing in all thy Pamphlet that proves any ſuch thing, but the contrary.

Quak. *Thy Dialogue is not onely a forgery, but it abounds with contradictions.*

Chr. This thou ſayſt, though the particulars thou haſt taken notice of evince no ſuch thing: However ſo it hath hapned (though I think not deſignedly by thee) thou haſt fully juſtified that Anſwer in the Catechiſm, p. 72. *You will make your Friends believe, we do nothing but contradict our ſelves:* Waſt thou adviſed and diſcreet herein thus to vindicate me, even whilſt thou art endeavouring to prove me guilty of forgery. But wherein do I contradict my ſelf?

Will any man (except a Quaker) ſay, That to deny the light within, to be a ſufficient rule to Salvation, and yet in ſome caſes appeal to it; and grant it ought to be obey'd, is a contradiction: I verily believe *G. Whitehead* knows not all things, and yet I believe he doth know ſome things, may I not appeal to him concerning that he knows, without being cenſured for contradicting my ſelf; ſurely *G. W.* the contradiction is not in my words, but in thy dark mind.

Quak. *Doſt thou not affirm what any of us have ſaid concerning the light within, is no more then what the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the man of ſin; and may as well prove* Mahomet *to be the true Chriſt, as the light within;* Dip. Pl. pag. 5.

Chr. Herein thou doſt onely confute a thing forg'd by thy ſelf, and not utter'd by me: Is this the way to quit thy ſelf from deceit and falſhood, which thou knowſt I have openly accuſed thee of?

The

The compariſon is not between the light within, and the man of Sin or *Mahomet*; but onely betwixt thoſe Signs and Wonders you boaſt of. And thoſe that *Mahomet*, or the man of Sin, may and do likewiſe pretend unto, ſee the *Dialogue*, *p.* 11, 12.

Quak. *Thou alſo ſay'ſt, That our obeying the commands of the living Word in us, is no other then a myſtical Romance; Herein thou haſt acted the prophane Romancer, and art a moſt irreligious Miſcreant*, Dip. Pl. p. 5, 6.

Chr. If thou art not condemned in thy own Conſcience for theſe wilful untruths, it will ſignifie very ill of thee: The *Dialogue* ſpeaks on this wiſe, *p.* 10. you ſay, You own Jeſus Chriſt, but then 'tis with ſuch a mental and myſtical reſervation, which is no other then a myſtical Romance. Canſt thou think that any ingenious and impartial Reader ſhould conceive otherwiſe of thee, then a deceitful and impertinent Scribler. That the Chriſt you own is no other then a myſtical Romance, ſhall be fully proved in this Diſcourſe following.

As for thoſe other things they are ſo frivolous, that I think them not worthy of any reply, believing that not any man who hath not loſt his reaſon, can conclude as thou doſt. 'Tis one thing to ſay, another thing to prove a man contradicts himſelf; ſuch an Antagoniſt as *G. Whitehead*, certainly was never yet met with, who inſtead of attending to the matters in Controverſie, contends onely with his own Imaginations.

Quak. *Why ſpeaks thou ſo ſlightly of* George Whitehead; *he is no ſuch impertinent perſon as thou*

wouldſt

wouldst represent him, we know his worth, &c.

Chr. No doubt you have too high a value for him, because you indeed know him not; what ever his errors, deceit, and hypocrisie be, your affection to his Person blinds your eyes, that you cannot, or will not see it: I must tell you, that had I been at his elbow when he was writing the *Dip. Pl.* I could not well have desired him to write more for my Vindication then he hath done.

Quak. *Why sayst thou so?*

Chr. Because the chief things objected against you he toucheth not, but manifestly falls under the whole charge, as before is hinted.

Quak. *This is but thy own imagination.*

Chr. I charg'd him for affirming the light within *to be the Divine Essence*; and he blames me for saying, 'Tis but a meer Creature, *Dip. Pl.* 13. In this then he clears me from any wrong done to him; I accuse you for denying the Person of Christ without you, And doth not he say, *Christ Jesus a person without us is not Scripture language, but the Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians*, Ibid. Why then should it be believed that herein I have wronged either you or him, since he himself doth so fully acquit me: Was not that Answer in the *Catechism, p.* 73. very pertinent, and truly given in your name. *Though we believe not that you have answer'd us, yet you will give it out, you have both answer'd and confuted us; and your Friends will believe what you say, which is enough to you.* Is not the *Dip. Pl.* calculated onely for the humour of your own Friends; but are you so void of reason as to think it to be a solid answer to the *Dialogue*?

Quak.

Quak. *Thou art a Lyar, and dost thou think that thy particular Election will secure thee from the reward of lyars,* G. W. Dip. Pl. *Epistle.*

Chr. Thou hast not proved one lye, neither do I hold such an Election as secures persons guilty of lying, from the reward of lyars. I see thou art driven to a strait, that since thou canst not rationally quarrel with the *Dialogue*, thou sets up a shaddow, a figment of thy own Brain to contend with.

Quak. *Dost thou not hold a particular election of thy own Party, and but of very few (if any others) besides, &c.* G. Whitehead.

Chr. I perceive thy Dictates are not infallible, for as thou hast not declared thy own, so neither hast thou written (nor indeed dost thou know) my belief in this matter: But what is all this to the *Dialogue*, why art thou concern'd so much about Election, who believes no such thing of persons, either absolute or conditionals; that Election you generally hold, is onely of the Seed, which is Christ himself; therefore thou dost but trifle, and fill up paper to no purpose; might it not therefore have been of more advantage to your Cause, if *William Penn* had concern'd himself in the examination of the Dialogue (as I expected he would). That what *G. Whitehead* could not do in his dull method and manner of reasoning, 'tis probable *William Penn*, with his Confidence and Rhetorique, might have done.

Quak. *What real Quaker ever spoke thus, that they who will not believe our sayings, we will not spare to condemn, and stigmatize them, and it concerns us to render them as ridiculous as we can.*

Chr.

Chr. If you would have nothing charged upon you but what is indeed utter'd by approved Quakers, whether it might not be neceſſary to give us a Catalogue of the Names of ſuch; or if you think not meet to do this, then to give us ſome certain intelligible Character how a real Quaker may be known; may that paſs for a Character which *Tho. Ruddyer* gave in my hearing, viz. *One that is come to the pure Language, to ſpeak thee and and thou*; then your Objection will be eaſily anſwer'd: Doth not one of your own tell us, that 'tis your manner to render ſuch odious, and the more effectually to weaken their Teſtimonies, you will fix upon them ſcurrilous and contemptible Appellations: And do not all men that know you, know this is true. But that I may fully ſatisfie you in this point, I ask whether *Edward Burroughs* was not an approved Quaker?

Quak. *Yea, he was endued with the Almighty Power of God, which lived and reigned in him: This his own Works will in a large meaſure teſtifie the truth of, a man able to ſtop the mouths of all Gainſayers; This is my teſtimony to this man of God, who hath been a bleſſing to the Lord in his Generation,* Joſiah Coale, his *Epiſtle* before *Edw. Burroughs* his Works in *Folio.*

Chr. Was this *Joſiah Coale* a real Quaker?

Quak. *He was ſo.*

Chr. In what reſpect did the Almighty Power of God live and raign in him; and how was he a bleſſing to the Lord, for I muſt confeſs I do not well underſtand the meaning of this teſtimony.

Quak. *'Tis no matter for anſwering ſuch cavilling Queſtions.*

Chr.

Chr. Who else gives their Testimony to *Edw. Burroughs* and his Works.

Quak. These memorable Works of Edw. Burroughs (printed for the good of Generations to come, 1672.) *is brought forth for us, and our Children, and such as are moderate, and well affected; greater desires hereof could not be in any, then in my own particular, I having travelled both to answer and serve the truth, and the desires of Friends herein; Let none condemn the honest plainness and harmless simplicity of any of his first Works here inserted, for many are living Witnesses that the Power and Wisdom of God did then appear and shew it self through such plainness and simplicity, to the confounding of the wisdom of many that seemed high and lofty. And thus, dear Friends, as the Salvation of our dear Brother* Edw. Burroughs, *according to his desire, whilst in the Body, I recommend this Volume of his Books, being therein the Truths, and your Servant* Ellis Hooks. See the Epistle Dedicatory to the *Quakers.*

Chr. Of what use and service do you judge these Works may be to you, and to your Children?

Quak. It may not be unnecessary for Friends and Children to read and peruse these Testimonies, Informations, and Vindications of Truth, where they are in a way of Controversie given forth; the reading whereof may be of service to them, they being in the light and inspiration of the Almighty, from which all Scriptures, or Writings, that are given forth, are profitable to the man of God for his accommodation; for though many of you are come to a particular satisfaction in the true Light, and know so much of Christ, so as

to

to dye for him, yet cannot ſo well diſpute for him: Though that be neceſſary, and few given up and accompliſhed for that Service; therefore there may be need for more to apply their hearts to wiſdom, Ellis Hooks, *ibid.*

Chr. If written Teſtimonies and Vindications be profitable to the Man of God, for his accommodation, to help him to Diſpute, as you plainly intimate: Doth not this interfere with that grand Notion of yours, which ſaith, You muſt do all *by the immediate motion of the power within.* But if the Light and Power which you and your Children have be not ſufficient of it ſelf to accompliſh you for this Service *of Diſputation for, and vindicating of that you call the Truth,* why then do you contend ſo much for its All-ſufficiency? me-thinks you who pretend to infallibility, ſhould be very careful to make one ſtory agree with another, and not thus to be taken in different tales, to the manifeſt diſparagement both of your ſelves and Opinions. But is this *Ellis Hooks* a true Quaker?

Quak. *Thou needſt not doubt that, foraſmuch as he was imploy'd in that Service, for the collecting and printing theſe Works of* Edw. Burroughs, *and alſo allow'd to prefix his Epiſtle before it. And there are others, who were and are in the Miniſtry, that hath given their Teſtimony to this Servant and Prophet of the Lord, as thou mayſt ſee in their Epiſtles before his Works.*

Shall Dayes, Moneths, and Years, wear out thy Name? Shall not thy noble and valiant Acts which thou haſt wrought through the Power of him that ſeparated thee from the Womb, live in Generations to come? The Children yet unborn ſhall have thee

in

in their mouths, and thy Works shall testifie of thee in Generations that yet have no Being, and shall account thee blessed: When I think of thee, I am melted into tears of sorrow, because of the want that the Inheritance of the Lord hath of thee. Francis Howgill.

As for Edw. Burroughs *our dear Brother and Companion in travel, suffering, and consolation for the everlasting Gospels sake, his Testimony lives with us; He was a Preacher of Righteousness, one who travell'd for the Redemption of the Creature from under the bondage of Corruption. The name of this Minister of Righteousness is written in the Lambs Book of Life,* George Whitehead; *His name is chronicled in the Lambs Book of Life, a righteous Plant, a valiant Warrier, more then a Conquerer; who is dead, but yet liveth amongst us, and amongst us is alive,* George Fox.

Chr. Being well assured from these Testimonies that *Edw. Burroughs* was an approved *Quaker*; then for the satisfaction of you and others in this Point, whether I have feigned a *Quaker*, as *Whitehead* suggests, or made them speak otherwise then in their own proper Dialect. I shall transcribe twenty questions, which I find *printed in thememorable Works of* Edw. Burroughs, together with the force and import of his Answers to each *Question*, as you will find, if you consult his Works in *Folio*, printed 1672. wherein the Spirit and Principles of the *Quakers* is not a little laid open. The questions were propounded (as that Book informs me) by one *Philip Bennet.*

1. *Q.* Whether the Word was made Flesh more or oftner then once?

Quak.

Quak. *In this Quere thou are manifested what thou art, where thou art, and what ſpirit thou art of, a Reprobate, a Child of Darkneſs: In this Quere thy ſpirit is ſeen and known in the eternal light; thou knoweſt not what thou askeſt, thy Quere comes from thy dark polluted mind: Thou art a ſtranger to the Life, without God in the World; the Light condemns thee, and all thy generation eternally. The Word made Fleſh we witneſs, which dwells amongſt us, and we behold his Glory, whereby we witneſs thee and all thy generation to be in the ſorcery and witchcraft; the light in thee will tell thee ſo, to which thou muſt be obedient before thou canſt witneſs the Word made Fleſh onc't, for thou art darkneſs it ſelf; when thou canſt witneſs the Word made Fleſh onc't, then thou wilt know whether the Son of God was made of a Woman more or oftner then onc't: But thou Dragon that would devour the Man-Child, thou the Dragon with thy Angels art caſt into the Earth. For thy other nineteen Queres thou haſt conjured them up in the Black Art, out of the bottomleſs Pit*, Edw. Burrough's Works in Folio, p. 29, 30.

Chr. Was ever Queriſt ſo rudely and uncivilly treated? or was ever queſtion thus ridiculouſly anſwer'd? was this the honeſt plainneſs and harmleſs ſimplicity of this man? and was this his ſilencing all Oppoſers? Is there any thing in the queſtion to provoke to ſuch Bedlam Rhetorick? to call a man Reprobate, Child of Darkneſs, a ſtranger to the Life, without God in the World; yea, and to damn him eternally, only for a modeſt and ſober enquiry; was this his valour for the Lamb? what means he by witneſſing the Word made Fleſh? Is it any thing more then the Seed, Light,

or

or Power within? But is this to the question? Doth the Scripture by the Word being made Flesh, intend onely the Light within? many thousands (that in all things walk not up to the light in them) do believe that the Word was made Flesh onc't, contrary to the bold assertion of this man, *That they must be obedient to the Light within, before they can witness* (or believe) *this thing.* 'Tis easie to guess what your notions are concerning the Word made Flesh; *Burrough* saith, the Querist is *darkness it self*; if so, then surely he had no light in him to tell him he was in the sorcery and witchcraft; If no light, how is your opinion true, That every man hath Christ, or his light in him; is it possible for that man (*in whom Christ or his Light is*) to be darkness it self? And how could he be obedient to the light within, if he had none to obey.

Again, is a serious proposal about the Word being made Flesh onc't, an argument of one being in the sorcery and witchcraft? O stupendious madness and folly! And if the Querist be the Dragon, and hath his Angels, I would willingly know (of some of them who have commended his memorable Works to the Ages to come) who or what these Angels are?

And since he hath already doom'd and pass'd sentence upon the rest of the Queres, as being conjured in the Black Art out of the bottomless Pit; we may plainly foresee what Answers they are like to be attended with, nevertheless I shall proceed.

(2. *Q.*) Whether did the man Christ, slain (in respect of God's Decree and efficacy) from the

foundation of the World, really and indeed, suffer death as upon the Cross at *Jerusalem* more or oftner then once?

Quak. *In this Quere thou Diviner art found adding to the Scriptures the Divination of thy own Brain, whereupon the Plagues of God are to be added to thee: Oh thou lyar, where doth the Scriptures speak as thou speaks here? But in the light thou art seen, and art for the condemnation: The man Christ we own, and witness, and the Lambs Book of life, which was slain from the foundation of the World; we witness the Lamb of God, and thee to be the Beast that makes war with the Lamb, and thou Antichrist, which looks at Christs death at* Jerusalem *alone; so let all thy Congregation see what they hold up that follows thee,* Edw. Burroughs, ibid. p. 30.

Chr. Can any man be the wiser for this Answer? Is it Antichristian to look at Christ's death at *Jerusalem?* Doth the man Christ die in you? and must he be onely look'd at as so dying? The question is plain, whether the man Christ did really suffer death as upon the Cross more then onc't? though *Edw. Burroughs* saith, 'Twas conjured up in the Black Art, and accordingly in his canting way answers, We witness the Lamb of God: But what is this witnessing to the point? or is Diviner, Lyar, and Beast, a fit reply to so harmless an enquiry; I see, though you cannot, or will not answer a question in plain and intelligible terms; yet you can and will freely curse and damn the Querist. And whilst you pretend to own and witness the Man Christ, &c. you sufficiently intimate your erronious thoughts concerning the Sufferings of Christ upon the Cross,

though

though you are ashamed or afraid to speak them out.

(3. *Q.*) Whether did the Man Christ really and indeed suffer in his own Person for that end, and after the same manner which he did upon the Cross at *Jerusalem*, before that time or since that time?

Quak. Here thou full of all subtilty, hast manifested thy poyson and enmity; but thou art seen with the Light, and with it condemn'd for ever: Christ Jesus in his own Person doth, and ever did suffer by thee, and such as thou art, after the same manner: Thou blind Pharisee and Blasphemer, wouldst thou have Christ have more ends in suffering then one, Ibid. p. 30.

Chr. Whether there be more poyson and enmity manifested in the *Question* or in the Answer, I leave others to judge: Was Christ indeed actually crucified upon the Cross by the *Querist*? and doth Christ alwayes suffer after the same manner, and for the same end, as he did when crucified at *Jerusalem*? If so, *How is the Body of Jesus Christ said to be offer'd once for all? And why is it call'd an offering of one Sacrifice*, Heb. 10. 10, 12, 14. Be free and plain, let us know whether you do believe that Christ did, and doth suffer in his own person for the same end, and after the same manner as he did upon the Cross, both before that time, and since that time, or deny it; else say, you cannot, or that 'tis not convenient to give a positive answer.

(4. *Q.*) Was not that death which the Man Christ suffer'd once, and but once, upon the Cross at *Jerusalem*, so satisfactory for all the Sins of the

Elect, as that the justice of God, did not, doth not require any suffering or working upon that account, either from Sinner or Saint?

Quak. *Here thou Jesuite art pleading for a Christ afar off thee, that Christ which died at* Jerusalem *did not satisfie for thee, who art an enemy to him, and art under the woe, and from that woe thou shalt never flee. The death of the Man Christ we own, and witness; The same Christ that suffer'd, we witness made manifest. And here thou lyar, art made manifest to be a lyar, who said, We deny that Christ which died at* Jerusalem; *so let thy mouth be stopt thou lyar, who art for the lake: And whereas thou queries, whether the justice of God be not satisfied for the Sins of the Elect; let shame strike thee in the face, that thou should take upon thee to speak to any people, and knowest not the Scripture: where reads thou, that God requires satisfaction for the Sins of the Elect, or laid any thing to their Charge; Let all people see whether thou be not a blind ignorant sot,* Ibid. p. 30, 31.

Chr. It seems by this Answer, 'tis Jesuitical to plead for that Christ which died at *Jerusalem*, which *Burroughs* calls a Christ afar off: Then in what sense must you be understood, when you say, You own the same Christ that suffer'd? If the death of the same man you do truly (and without reserved meanings) acknowledge, why do you stigmatize the Queriſt for pleading for that Christ? The Queriſt is accused for a lyar, for saying, You deny that Christ which died at *Jerusalem*, and yet *Edw. Burroughs calls him Jesuit, for pleading for a Christ afar off*; Is not this to acquit his Accuser, and plainly to condemn himself for a rash

rash and peevishmen. That *Burroughs* did really lye and dissemble in his pretences to own the same Christ, doth in part appear in his Answer, and will more fully in the sequel of this Dialogue.

How did this Quaker know, that Christ did not satisfie for the Queriſt, and that he was under that woe, from which he should not escape? What means he by the Elect, for whom no satisfaction is required? and to whose charge nothing is laid? was not Christ's death for Sin? then either for the sins of the Elect, or for the sins of others; not for the Elect, nor for the Queriſt; for whose sins then? 'Tis evident enough, he intended 'twas onely *for the Seed, which Seed is Christ*, so that Sinners are no wayes concern'd in the Sufferings of Jesus Christ, unless you will say, *That Christ in man is a Sinner*: O the patience and forbearance of God, that should bear with such Blasphemies as these are; that ever men pretending to infallible Teachings, should so render the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, and his Sufferings, as to expose them to the greatest scorn and contempt.

(5. Q.) Whether you be reconciled to God by any other Obedience, then that very Obedience which Christ perform'd in his own Person, or by any suffering or death then that which Christ suffer'd upon the Cross at *Jerusalem?*

Quak. *Silence Flesh, wouldst thou who art an enemy to God, know how we are reconciled to God, and by what Obedience; own the light in thy Conscience, and be obedient to that, then thou shalt know by what Obedience we are reconciled to God: For yet*

thou knowest no Obedience, but art an enemy to the Cross of Christ, and in the mystery of Iniquity, and in the dark power of the Man of Sin: What hast thou to do to talk of Obedience, thou art blind, and in the broad way that leads to Death, Ibid. p. 31.

Chr. Is this to give a reason of your Hope with meekness and fear? Suppose the Querist as ignorant as his Answerer would represent him, ought he not to have endeavoured his Information; the question doth deserve a better reply then here is given to it; what inconvenience can there be in giving a serious and solid account, how we are reconciled to God? Was not *Edw. Burroughs* either ashamed or afraid to speak out what that Obedience is by which you are reconciled. *William Penn*, I must confess, herein is more free and ingenious with us, He confidently affirms, *Justification by that Righteousness which Christ fulfil'd in his own Person without us, is a Doctrine of Devils*, Apolog. p. 148. I doubt not but *Burrough* was of the same mind, though he kept it secret from the Querist as much as in him lay: Hitherto you see we have not one direct Answer to any Question.

(6. Q.) Whether did not the Man Christ suffer as a publick Person in the Elects stead, or in their behalf, and for that end, That none who believed in him might die eternally?

Quak. Thou blind Guide makes it manifest, that thou knowest not the Man Christ at all, nor his Sufferings; A publick Person he is, not to thee, but a mystery thou knows nothing of; and for the redeeming of the Elect from under such mouths as thine, Christ did

and

and doth suffer, and those that believe, deny such dumb idol Shepherds as thee, Ibid. p. 31.

Chr. Still nothing but Impertinent Ravings, instead of a direct Answer? What doth the *Quaker* intend by the Man Christ, and his Sufferings, which he saith the Querist knows not at all? Is Christ a publick Person or not? did he die for this end, That all who believe in him might not die eternally, or did he not? who, or what is the Elect that is under the mouths of such as the Querist? for the redeeming of whom Christ did and doth suffer: And what is that which Christ doth now suffer for the Redemption of the Elect? and what that Bondage is from which he redeems? And what is meant by believing? and in whom? Is it in that Person who suffer'd upon the Cross? or the Light within? Do not equivocate, but speak to the Point directly, whether that Person that is distinct from all other persons; He that was in the World, and died upon the Cross, rose again, and is now at the right hand of God, be that very Christ we are to believe in? or that it is not our Duty and Interest so to do, but meerly to believe in, and obey the light within, as the onely Mediator between God and Sinners. Let us know your minds herein in down-right terms, and do not put us off with your witnessings, which to us signifie nothing.

(7. Q.) Whether the Sufferings of Christ, now in his Saints, be all the satisfaction that is made to, or which the justice of God looks for, for sins pasts, present, and to come?

Quak. Thou Blasphemer askest thou knowst not what, Is not Christ the same as ever? and is not the

Sufferings of Christ satisfactory where ever? what will satisfie, if the Sufferings of Christ will not satisfie? Let all people take notice what a Blasphemer thou art, or what can they learn from such as thee, who knows neither the Justice of God, nor the Sufferings of Christ in his Saints, Ibid. p. 31.

Chr. In answer to the fourth Question, *this Quaker* deny'd the Sufferings of Christ to be *satisfactory either for the Elect or others*, and here he grants his Sufferings are satisfactory where-ever, but tells us not to whom, nor for whom they are so: And whereas he talks of Christ's Sufferings in his Saints, I would quere, whether his Sufferings in that sense be all the satisfaction that is made to, or which the Justice of God requires? Again, it may not be amiss to observe a little the *policy of this man*, who, that he might the better hide, and prevent any suspition of himself being a Blasphemer, he indites and arraigns the Querist as such, perfectly in this, imitating the Devil, who will charge upon another his own fault; that thus it is, consider the Quakers Opinion of Christ in his Saints, which is, *'tis God, and his eternal Power*; but doth God and his Power Suffer and die in his Saints? *Is this to exalt the Deity of the Son of God* (which sometimes you pretend to do) to make him subject to death, and to death in you; but pray, how can an immortal, immutable Spirit die, and in what sense is such a death satisfactory? But the misery is, ask what question we will, in the plainest terms we can, the Quakers will answer equivocally, and not let us know their minds (as one of them said, *We do not use to trust such with our Opinions*) as if they were ashamed

ashamed to own the things themselves believe.

(8. Q.) Whether was not that Body of Jesus which was offer'd upon the Cross at *Jerusalem*, the one and onely Sacrifice for Sin God accepted, to which all the Saints did, and do look to be justified without any other Works?

Quak. *Here thou replyes thy sottish Queries, which risest out of thy dark mind, concerning the Body of Jesus, as the Devil did about the body of* Moses; *let thy mouth be stopt, for the Body of Jesus thou knowst not, nor what it consists on; and the offering of it up, thou knowst nothing of; Thou art none of the Saints, but without in the World. for thee the Body of Christ is no satisfaction: And thou Reprobate, what hast thou to do to talk of believing, that is the condition of the Saints, whose Works thou knowst not; Thou disobedient one, upon whom God will render Vengeance in flaming fire,* Ibid. p. 32.

Chr. On the rudeness and unworthiness of this Answerer, who took no farther notice of the Question. then to vent his rancour and spleen against the Querist: *Surely the venome of Asps was under this mans tongue.* 'Tis to be bewail'd, that a serious question concerning that one and onely Sacrifice, Christ offer'd, should be parallel'd *with the Devils contending about the body of* Moses; and that such *who will be disputing about the Body of Jesus*, must be branded for Reprobates (*Naylors Love to the lost*, p. 57. *Printed* 1656.) Had it not been better to have condemn'd such Dictates as these to perpetual Oblivion, then to print them for the Generations to come? And forasmuch as he saith, what the Body of Jesus consists of, and

the

the offering of it up, the Querist knew nothing of, 'tis evident he intends another body then that which he took of the Virgin, but what that is, he acquaints us not.

(9. Q.) Whether there be any other Righteousnes, by which Christ the Saints are justified in the sight of God, then that which Works in them and by them?

Quak. *Thou art accursed, and made manifest, who preacheth another Gospel, and wouldst have another Righteousnes then that of Christ: Thou Beast, to whom the Plagues of God are due, upon whom the Wrath of God must be accomplished, who would have another Righteousnes then that which Christ works in the Saints, and by them; Thou wouldst be justified, and live in thy sin, but thou art shut out from God for ever; we witness Justification by Faith*, Ibid. p. 32.

Chr. There is nothing in the question importing another Righteousnes, then that of Christs; was it not then more then enough for him to censure and damn the Querist, but must he needs insinuate a wilful lye to compleat his wickedness, that the Quakers, and their Children may be accomplisht for dispute, and know how to answer their Opposers, as *Ellis Hooks intimates in his Epistle. Burroughs* saith, We witness Justification by Faith, which is no other then your usual canting, neither doth it in any wise conclude the question: Indeed, when he calls the *Querist Beast*, upon whom the wrath of God must be accomplished, because he would (as the Quaker imagines) have another Righteousnes, then that which Christ works in the Saints, and by them.

Here-

Herein, I must confess, he plainly denies that there is any other Righteousness, and consequently all that Christ did and suffered without us, is utterly unconcern'd in this business of Justification, directly repugnant to *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. *Isa.* 53. 5, 11.

(10. *Q.*) Whether doth Sanctification or Justification in order antecede holiness of life, or Justification by Faith go before; or whether doth not God love man, ere man lov'd God?

Quak. Here thou dark blind Hypocrite hast shut out thy self from the knowledge of God in any measure: Oh that people should be so blind, as to look to learn any thing of such as thee but Sin and Filthyness; what hast thou been teaching, that neither knows Justification nor Sanctification, but art quering which goes before: Let all people Judge whether thou be not a Teacher of lasciviousness, sin, and uncleanness. How dareſt thou mention a holy life? thou man which art Cain, *God doth not love nor accept thee, nor thy Sacrifice; and for Justification by Faith, thou knowſt nothing of it, which we own and witness,* Ibid. p. 32.

Chr. Was this the plainness and simplicity through which (you say) he did coufound the wisdom of the high and lofty? was this your dear Brother in the Lord? *as George Whitehead calls him.* 'Tis too apparent he was under the Dominion, rule, and government of a most wicked, lying, and reviling Spirit. Can any man or men conclude the *Queriſt* to be a Teacher of Lasciviousness, meerly for asking, whether Sanctification or Justification do not in order go before holiness of life? Certainly the Children yet un-

unborn, if they should see these his Works, will have him in their mouths as a most ridiculous, impertinent, and railing person.

(11. Q.) Whether the Justice of God be fully satisfied for all the sins of the Elect, ere Christ appear to their Souls, or holiness appear in their Lives?

Quak. *Here thou full of all subtilty art comprehended, and with the light of Christ thou art seen, and with the life thou art judg'd and condemn'd: Who would lay Sin to the charge of the Elect, thou Sorcerer, doth the Elect of God sin? shall the Elect die? To that in thy Conscience I speak*, Ibid. p. 32.

Chr. If the Elect of God neither do, *nor never did sin*; 'tis meet we should know who or what is meant by the Elect: who shall lay any thing to the charge of the Elect? *'tis God that justifies, who shall condemn? 'tis Christ that died*, Rom. 8. 33, 34. If by the Elect be intended persons, then either they are or were Sinners; but if by the Elect you mean *a meer Principle, Spirit, or seed in man*: Then I ask you, How God is said to justifie that? and in what sense did Christ die for this Seed? If Justification do suppose a guilt, I quere in what respect this spirit or seed in man may be said to be guilty? If you say, It never did, nor doth Sin, how then doth God justifie it? and what necessity was there of Christ's dying for that which was perfectly sinless? *To that* (as thy phrase is) *in thy Conscience do I now speak.*

(12. Q.) Whether the holy Lives and Works of the Saints be not excluded from the act of Justi-

Justification from the guilt of Sin?

Quak. *Thou dead Beast, thou art a stranger from the life of God, and is excluded from the holy life of the Saints, and their works, Thou art unredeemed from thy vain Conversation, & and so art not justified, nor never shall be: And by the same that the Saints are justified, thou art condemn'd into the lake for ever*, Ibid. p. 32, 33.

Chr. This answer (like the rest) is full of pride, rage, and folly; who will believe that Testimony which you most unadvisedly have given of this man, That he was a faithful Servant and Prophet of the Lord: Did ever any foame out their own shame more then this *your pretended Prophet*, who impudently assumes to himself the authority *of determining the eternal condition of the Quæriſt*; tells him, & He neither is, *nor never shall be justified*; may it not be with respect to this cursing and railing humour, which was predominant in him, That you call him a Son of Thunder. But whether *Edw. Burroughs* hath spoken any thing pertinently, and properly to the question, I shall leave it to others, yea *to that in thy Conscience* to judge.

(13. *Q.*) Whether that Righteousness which is wrought by the Saints be every way answerable to the Justice of God?

Quak. *There again thy blindness is made manifest; Is there any Righteousness but that of Christ Jesus? and is not that every way answerable to the justice of God? But such polluted filthy Beasts as thou wouldst have another Righteousness; but thy Righteousness we deny, and the Righteousness of Christ we witness, which shall be reveal'd on thee in flames of fire*, Ibid. p. 33.

Chr.

Chr. Did ever man pretending (*I will not say to perfection or infallibility, but*) to reason or modesty, reply at this rate? Did every question affright him, and put him into such a consternation, as that he could express himself no otherwise then like one perfectly mad. There is not the least intimation in any of the foregoing questions asserting *any other Righteousness* but that of Christ's, and yet this wretched man had the confidence to say, Such filthy Beasts (as he was pleas'd to account the Querist) would have another Righteousness; Art not thou ashamed of this injustice and lying, which thy dear *Brother Edw. Burroughs* was guilty of? to talk of your witnessing the Righteousness of Christ, is no more but your common and idle prating, and nothing to the point in question: Must we be concluded onely by what you ignorantly and impudently say you witness?

(14. Q.) Whether none be accounted righteous in the light of God, in whom is any corruption or failing, or who do not fulfil the Law, and answer every demand of Justice?

Quak. Here thou polluted Beast makes it manifest what thou hast been driving at all this while, which is, that thou wouldst have thy corruption and filthiness to be accounted righteous in God's sight, that so thou mayst wallow in thy filthiness: But John *saith, He that commits sin is of the Devil; The Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil, and thou man of Sin wouldst have it stand;* ☞ *God doth not accept any where there is any failing, or who do not fulfil the Law, and answer every demand of Justice,* Ibid. p. 33.

Chr.

Chr. This queſtion (I do confeſs) hath the favour of a direct and poſitive anſwer, though it be introduced *with his wonted railing, together with a wilful lye*; certainly had not *Edw. Burroughs* been deſperate, and utterly deſtitute of any ſerious reſpect either to God or man, or his own credit, he durſt not have attempted to fix ſo notorious an untruth upon the *Queriſt*, as that he would have corruption and filthineſs to be accounted righteous in God's ſight: There is not any thing of ſuch an import in the queſtion, which is not whether failing and corruption may be accounted righteous, but whether none in whom is any failing or corruption may be ſo; corruption and failing is one thing, the perſon in whom it may be is another.

But to his anſwer, *God accepts not any who do not fulfil the Law, and anſwer every demand of Juſtice*; If ſo, woe be to you Quakers, as well as to any others, for certainly you cannot be ſaved according to this Principle; you are far (however you flatter your ſelves) from fulfilling the Law, and anſwering every demand of Juſtice; with *Edw. Burroughs* agrees another of your Miniſtry, namely *William Penn, Sandy Foundation*, p. 29, 30.

Obedience to Juſtification (ſaith he) *ought to be as perſonally extenſive, as was mans Diſobedience to Condemnation; in which real (not imputative) ſenſe thoſe various terms of Sanctification, Righteouſneſs, Reſurrection, Life, Redemption, Juſtification, &c. are moſt infallibly underſtood; for impute or imputing ſignifies no more in Scriptures, but to expreſs men really and perſonally to be that which is imputed*

to them, whether as guilty, or remitted. For (saith he) *any to be justified from the imputation of anothers Righteousness, is both ridiculous and dangerous; whence came that usual saying amongst many Professors of Religion, That God looks not upon them as they are in themselves, but as they are in Christ.* According to the drift and scope *of Penns* Discourse, this usual saying must come from the *conceivings of the dark imputarians of this Age:* But I must tell Mr. *Penn* whatever his deluded fancy may be concerning himself, miserable will be his condition, *if God do look upon him onely, as he is in himself:* The time will come he may curse the day that ever he entertain'd such an opinion, or that it was his sad lot *to fall amongst such a people,* who render Jesus Christ in all his undertakings for Sinners, no more then a meer cipher. For saith *Edw. Burroughs,* ☞ *God will not accept of any who do not fulfil the Law, and answer every demand of Justice.* O ye wretched men, that should in such a day and Nation, have the face to utter such a Doctrine as this is, which casheers the whole Gospel, and turns it out of doors.

(15. *Q.*) Whether a Soul be justified before God by the non-imputation of Sin, and the imputation of the Righteousness of Christ's Person to his Faith, or by a Righteousness wrought by Christ in the person justified, or to be justified.

Quak. Stop thy mouth thou Sorcerer, which art gathering up a heap of confusion, fit for nothing but to be turn'd into the bottomless pit; wherein thou talks of imputation and non-imputation, and of a person justified and to be justified. Thy language is

the

the language of Egypt, *and in the mystery of Iniquity, which is condemn'd into the lake of Perdition by the light of Christ: I own no Righteousness but what is of Christ, and is wrought by him; which Righteousness shall confound thee, and all thy unrighteousness and conjurations, the same that justifies us, shall condemn thee eternally*, Ibid. p. 33.

Chr. If this was a man of God, who may we account a man of——. The memorable Works of this *Edw. Burroughs* may serve as Memorials to all men, to dread *the Spirit and Principles of the Quakers*, these instances being such Monuments of their folly and madness: He saith, *That imputation and non-imputation, and to talk of a person justified and to be justified, is the language of* Egypt, *and is condemn'd to the lake of Perdition by the Light.* But what kind of Light should this be, that should thus fatally doom such a question? and brand the person asking it for a *Sorcerer?* He saith, *He owns no other Righteousness but what is wrought by Christ*; But not one word, *whether this Righteousness is wrought without us, or within us, or both*, which is the thing the question aims at. If the Querist was, or if any person else be ignorant herein, so they may remain, for any thing that *Burroughs* hath here contributed towards their information.

(16. *Q.*) Whether Christ be in the Saints in respect of that Nature wherein he suffer'd at *Jerusalem?*

Quak. Here thou enemy of Christ wouldst know how the Saints enjoy Christ; the Scripture is fulfil'd on thee the light shines in darkness, and the darkness comprehends it not; when thou comes to own thy

Condemnation the light in thy Conscience, then thou wilt know that Nature that Christ suffer'd in: But now thou art in the nature that Judas *was in that betray'd him & that they were in that crucified him,* Ibid. p. 33.

Chr. Is there in this reply one word to the question? could he not have answerd *yea* or *nay*, else where he grants that he who was slain upon the Cross is the very Christ of God, *and that the very Christ of God was in him*, Ibid. p. 149. From whence we may infer, That the light within was crucified at *Jerusalem:* Must this pass for an infallible dictate? surely not with any who are not under the influence of the *Quakers* delusions. But wherefore did *Burroughs* remain under such a Paroxism of fury, was it not because each question did strike too closely at your vile Opinions?

(17 Q.) How and in what manner Christ, who in respect of his Divine Nature, is in all places, may be said to be in a Saint, and not in a Reprobate?

Quak. *What hast thou to do to quere after the Divine Nature, who art the natural man, who knows nothing of God, but what thou knowest naturally as a bruit beast: The manner of Christs Divine Nature is hid from thy eyes; with that eye thou shouldst see, with that thou art blind: And the manner of his being in the Saints thou knowst not, who art a Reprobate, and shalt find him to thy eternal condemnation,* Ibid. p. 33, 34.

Chr. It is a lamentable thing, that a man for asking, How and in what respect Christ may be said to be in a Christian? must be put off with such a taunting reply as this, *What hast thou to do to quere, thou knowst nothing but as a bruit beast, thou Reprobate.* Is this to instruct with meekness and fear? we see, that if we do not believe your say-

sayings without farther enquiry what will come on't, namely, to be curs'd and damn'd eternally. 'Twas pity this question did not fall into the hands of a more judicious person then *Edw. Burroughs*, who neither treats the *Querist*, nor his question, like a Christian, or a sober man.

(18 Q.) Whether doth Christ now in these days assume, or take upon him, the form of a Servant, & the seed of *Abraham*, that is our flesh, and whether doth not this assumption cause such a perfection of the Godhead and the Manhood, as that both of them together are united into one Person.

Quak. *O thou dark Beast and Conjurer, quering with thy conjured words, that which thou knowst nothing of, and is out of thy reach and comprehension: Thou Blasphemer, dost thou limit Christ to dayes, in taking upon him the form of a Servant, and the seed of* Abraham; *Is not he the same now as ever he was? for the union of the Godhead with the Manhood, as thou calls it: Let thy mouth be stopt, for with thee God nor none of his Children hath any union; God hath put an utter enmity betwixt thy seed, thou Serpent, and the seed of the woman. And the perfect union with Christ we witness, therefore are we separate from thee and thy Generation,* Ibid. p. 34.

Chr. I perceive he that sate him on, carried him through; otherwise, by this time, we might reasonably conclude he should have been drawn dry of his virulent and undecent expressions: Be the question what it will, he was at no loss for words to stigmatize and vilifie the *Querist*; yet was at a real and marvellous loss to give a direct answer to the purpose, almost all the questions hath a fair, or rather (if you will) a foul go-by:

Let me seriously ask thee, whether thou dost indeed believe that *Edw. Burroughs was in the meekness, plainness and simplicity?* when he did represent the person that asked, whether Christ doth now take upon him the form of a Servant, *to be a dark Beast and Conjurer?* Dost thou believe that Christ now in these dayes takes on him the form of a Servant? our Flesh, as once he did? Do not reply in equivocal terms, but speak honestly and plainly to the question; we ask you not, what you witness, we will not be determined by your vain boasts, or deluded fancies.

(19. Q.) Whether Christ is now conversant with men upon Earth, since his Ascension, as he was before, and in those times wherein the Apostles lived?

Quak. *Thy quere bewrayes thee, thy language is the language of* Egypt; *thou makest it clearly manifest, thou knowst not Christ in any measure, where the first principle of truth is made manifest; it is the same that ever was: Thou askest whether Christ be not now conversant upon Earth amongst men since his Ascension, as he was in the Apostles times; dost thou know what thou askest? Did not Christ appear to his Apostles since his ascension in the most glorious manner that ever was? and is he not the same now as he was then? what? wouldst thou make of Christ, the* dark Scottish beast, *such a one as thy self*, Ibid. p. 34.

Chr. This man took a liberty to say anything, but what was to the purpose; 'tis amazing to think that a person under his Character, being under no surprize or provocation, should deliberately write such gross Errors and Untruths, together with such a heap of scurrilous and filthy Rail-

Railings, and cause these to be printed for the view of future Generations. *Burrought* asks, whether Christ did not appear to the Apostles since his Ascension? *who denies he did:* But what is this to the question, whether *Christ be now conversant with men upon Earth since his Ascension, as he was before?* To this the Quaker Replies, What would thou make of Christ, *thou dark sottish beast?* But whether this be a solution of the question, I submit it to others.

(20. Q.) Whether Christ did not dwell amongst the Saints after another manner, and more visible then now he dwells in them?

Quak. *Here thou shews thy ignorance, and for thy word* visible *he is not, nor never visible to thee, nor thy Generation; for those that did profess the Scriptures as thou, and thy Generation doth, crucified him: Thou Blasphemer, where saith the Scripture that Christ would dwell after another manner in his Saints?* Ibid. p. 34.

Chr. In this Answer, the Quaker denies that Christ was ever *visible* to wicked men (such as he esteems the Querist to be) and consequently denies *that person call'd in the Scriptures by this name, who convers'd here in the World, and suffer'd death openly and visibly at* Jerusalem *to be the Christ*; for that Christ was visible to wicked men: But this bold man saith, *Christ was never visible* to such as the Querist is: Are not these things *justly offensive to Christian ears?* 'Tis too evident in your acknowledgments of Jesus Christ, you do but abuse your Readers, in owning that in words which in truth you really deny, and do steal away the truth from the less wary reader or hearer, even then when in

Let me ſeriouſly ask thee, whether thou doſt indeed believe that *Edw. Burroughs was in the meekneſs, plainneſs and ſimplicity?* when he did repreſent the perſon that asked, whether Chriſt doth now take upon him the form of a Servant, *to be a dark Beaſt and Conjurer?* Doſt thou believe that Chriſt now in theſe dayes takes on him the form of a Servant? our Fleſh, as once he did? Do not reply in equivocal terms, but ſpeak honeſtly and plainly to the queſtion; we ask you not, what you witneſs, we will not be determined by your vain boaſts, or deluded fancies.

(19. Q.) Whether Chriſt is now converſant with men upon Earth, ſince his Aſcenſion, as he was before, and in thoſe times wherein the Apoſtles lived?

Quak. *Thy quere bewrayes thee, thy language is the language of* Egypt; *thou makeſt it clearly manifeſt, thou knowſt not Chriſt in any meaſure, where the firſt principle of truth is made manifeſt; it is the ſame that ever was: Thou askeſt whether Chriſt be not now converſant upon Earth amongſt men ſince his Aſcenſion, as he was in the Apoſtles times; doſt thou know what thou askeſt? Did not Chriſt appear to his Apoſtles ſince his aſcenſion in the moſt glorious manner that ever was? and is he not the ſame now as he was then? what? wouldſt thou make of Chriſt, thou* dark ſottiſh beaſt, *ſuch a one as thy ſelf*, Ibid. p. 34.

Chr. This man took a liberty to ſay any thing, but what was to the purpoſe; 'tis amazing to think that a perſon under his Character, being under no ſurprize or provocation, ſhould deliberately write ſuch groſs Errors and Untruths, together with ſuch a heap of ſcurrilous and filthy Rail-

Railings, and cause these to be printed for the view of future Generations. *Burroughs* asks, whether Christ did not appear to the Apostles since his Ascension? *who denies he did:* But what is this to the question, whether *Christ be now conversant with men upon Earth since his Ascension, as he was before?* To this the Quaker Replies, What would thou make of Christ, *thou dark sottish beast?* But whether this be a solution of the question, I submit it to others.

(20. Q.) Whether Christ did not dwell amongst the Saints after another manner, and more visible then now he dwells in them?

Quak. *Here thou shews thy ignorance, and for thy word* visible *he is not, nor never visible to thee, nor thy Generation; for those that did profess the Scriptures as thou, and thy Generation doth, crucified him: Thou Blasphemer, where saith the Scripture that Christ would dwell after another manner in his Saints?* Ibid. p. 34.

Chr. In this Answer, the Quaker denies that Christ was ever *visible* to wicked men (such as he esteems the Querist to be) and consequently denies *that person call'd in the Scriptures by this name, who convers'd here in the World, and suffer'd death openly and visibly at* Jerusalem *to be the Christ*; for that Christ was visible to wicked men: But this bold man saith, *Christ was never visible* to such as the Querist is: Are not these things *justly offensive to Christian ears?* 'Tis too evident in your acknowledgments of Jesus Christ, you do but abuse your Readers, in owning that in words which in truth you really deny, and do steal away the truth from the less wary reader or hearer, even then when in

words you seem to confess it. It is blasphemy (saith *Edw. Burroughs*) To say Christ dwells in another manner in the Saints, then once he did amongst them; which is as much as to say, *Christ is not a person without them.* Did *Edw. Burroughs believe* that these replies of his were proper answers to the questions.

Quak. *Blessed be the Lord that hath discovered thee; so thy queries are answer'd in the eternal life and light of God, and Judgment is given upon thee and them, which thou shalt eternally witness: Thy queries are answer'd lovingly and plainly, and in the Scripture language and terms, and with the eternal light and life of God set thee in thy own place, which thou shalt eternally witness,* Ibid. p. 34.

Chr. What horrid blasphemy, arrogance, and wilful lying, are these few concluding words guilty of? to say these queries are answer'd in *the eternal life and light of God*, is a most blasphemous *intituling the Divine Majesty to all* Edw. Burroughs *his multiplyed Railings, Lies, and Impertinencies*; Could the Devil himself have been more vile? and was it not prodigious arrogancy in this man to take upon him *to determine a mans endless condition?* Is it not also a most odious lye, to say these queries are answer'd *lovingly and plainly, in Scripture language and terms?* Is railing, cursing, and damning a person, *loving and plain answers?* Is sot and sottish Beast, &c. *Scripture language and terms?* The Lord in mercy deliver us from such Prophets, who are justly worthy of the abhorrence of all men.

Thus I have given you some account of the memorable works (*of this eminent Quaker*) printed 1672, with the Epistles of *Ellis Hooks, Josiah Coale, George*

George Whitehead, *Francis Howgill*, and *George Fox*, that the Ages to come may ſee what monſters this Age produced: *O my Soul come not thou into their Secrets, unto their Aſſembly*, Gen. 49. 6. I preſume by this time thou maiſt be ſatisfied, that I have not wrong'd you in the Dialogue, but did therein repreſent you, and your manner of ſpeaking, in more favourable terms then you ſee I could, or might have done, what farther have you to object?

Quak. *We ſay they are lyes and ſlanders, and thou art a moſt irreligious miſcreant.*

Chr. Several of you (*that were moved thus to expreſs your minds*) being asked, whether you had read the Dialogue? *anſwer'd No*; How then do you know they are all lyes? Is it not a moſt diſingenious thing to paſs ſentence on you know not what? I ſee 'tis as eaſie to waſh the *Blackmoor* white, as 'tis to reclaim you from this accuſtomed evil. Thoſe of you who have read the Dialogue, may know (if you will) that I have not onely quoted your Books, but have done it truly and honeſtly; can this then be of any Service to you, when any perſon that examines the quotations, may ſee your error: As for that term miſcreant, *George Whitehead* is pleas'd to impoſe upon me; I think it unworthy of any farther notice then this, that for want of argument, he takes up dirt, which was no wayes becoming him, having told us in print, *That he never found any man convinced by ill language, Divinity of Chriſt*, p. 89. What more haſt thou to ſay?

Quak. *Thou ſayſt, We hold the Soul to be God, whereas we diſtinguiſh between the Power that ſaves, and that which is ſaved*, G. W. Dip. Pl. p. 15.

Chr. Did I not cite your metropolitan *G. Fox*? direct you to his Book and Page, where you may read these words, *That the Soul is part of Gods Being, without beginning, and infinite*; Dareſt thou ſay, I have not quoted him truly? But ſaith *George Whitehead*, We diſtinguiſh between the Soul and its Saviour; So doth *G. Fox* ſeem to diſtinguiſh, When he calls God the Biſhop of the Soul, notwithſtanding which, he ſaith, The Soul is a part of Gods Being; If then there be any thing in his diſtinction, 'tis onely this, *That one part of God is Biſhop over another. George Whitehead* alſo pretends to diſtinguiſh between Chriſt, and his light or gift, *Apolog.* 35. And yet in his *Dip. Pl. p.* 13. ſaith, *The life is the light of men, and this life and light is divine and increated*; ſo that the meaning of his diſtinction muſt be, *That Chriſt is not divine and increated, but his Light is*: If both be increated, what ſignifies his diſtinction? *James Naylor* likewiſe diſtinguiſheth between *the light and the ſeed within*, and yet tells us, *The light is Chriſt, and the ſeed is Chriſt*; ſo that your diſtinguiſhing is but a colluſion to baffle and amuſe ſimple and ignorant people: Hence, as one of your own Friends hath ſaid of you, we find but too true; though your years have been but few, yet you have been exceeding expert in learning the ſubtilties (*that is, the equivocations*) of the Papiſts. Who of you ever writ againſt this poſition of *George Fox* concerning the Soul? Or which of you dare give it under your hands, That herein your *Superintendent was deceived*?

Quak.

Quak. *Whereas thou hast said, we deny the Person of Christ, herein thou art a lyar; the person of Christ we own and witness.*

Chr. But do you acknowledge him to be a distinct person without you?

Quak. *Jesus Christ a Person without us, is not Scripture language, but the Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians*, Whitehead, Dip. Pl. p. 13.

Chr. If Jesus Christ be not a Person distinct from you, who or what is Jesus Christ?

Quak. *'Tis God himself*; if God be the Light, and that Light be Christ, then God is Christ, *Penns Innocency with open face*, p. 8. *Again, 'tis the light in us*, we own no other Redeemer but that Person, the Son of God, who died at *Jerusalem, who is the light in us*, *Naylor* and *Hubborthorns* answer to the *Phanatique History*, p. 13.

Chr. You say you own the Person of Christ, is the light in you a person? and is it the very Son of God? and did it indeed die at *Jerusalem?*

Quak. *We say, He that was slain upon the Cross is the very Christ of God, and the very Christ of God is in us*, Burroughs Works, *p.* 9. 149.

Chr. If God be Christ, as *Penn saith*; or if the Light within you be the Christ, as *Naylor* and *Hubberthorne affirm*? Is it proper or safe to say, God was slain, or that the Light in you was crucified?

Quak. *Ye have condemn'd and kill'd the Just*, James 5. 5, 6. *that is, Christ Jesus in their hearts, him they crucified*, G. Keith. *Immediat. Revelation*, p. 77.

Chr. Is Christ really and indeed crucified in the hearts of men onely.

Quak. *As Christ is and lives in himself, he cannot*

be

he crucified, but his appearance may, Keith. Ibid.

Chr. You distinguish between *Christ, and his appearance*; and say, He himself cannot, but his appearance may be crucified; Is not this as much as to say, His appearance is but a Creature? But how will this agree with the Dictates of others of your Ministry, who say, The Light within *is divine and increated*: I perceive if we examine you distinct, your tales will not agree. And when *G. Keith.* saith, Ye kill'd the Just, that is *Christ Jesus:* Must we believe that this Just is not indeed Christ Jesus, but onely his appearance; consequently when the Scripture saith, Christ was crucified, we must not understand it was Christ himself, *but onely an Image, appearance, or some representation of him was crucified*, and all this too within our Hearts. But is this one of those things which you say are *necessary to be reveal'd to you, which are not to be found in the Scriptures, no not so much as by consequence*, Ibid. p. 3, 4.

Quak. *Now thy perverse and cavilling mind discovers it self.*

Chr. Do you believe that Christ is now in Person at the right hand of God?

Quak. *He is at the right hand of God, but I cannot believe he hath a personal being at the right hand of God without all men*, G. Whitehead, *Christ ascended*, p. 18. *Christ in Person remote in a body of flesh, and not in men, is not Scripture, but added*, Ibid. p. 69.

Chr. What then do you intend by the right hand of God, and of Christs being there?

Quak. *Christ, nor Gods right hand, is not to be limited to a remoteness from the Saints*, Ibid. p. 18. *What do you mean by Gods right hand, and Christs being*

being at Gods right hand, that would seem to confine them out of all men, Ibid. p. 20, 21.

Chr. Is Christ no otherwise at Gods right hand, then as he is in you?

Quak. *'Tis a false and lying Imagination to imagine either Christ or God, and his right hand, to be so remote as not to dwell in any man*, Whitehead, Ibid. p. 69.

Chr. Is the heavens, that must retain him till the times of the restitution of all things, onely the hearts of men?

Quak. *I have told thee plainly, that neither Christ, nor Gods right hand are so remote, as not to dwell in men, and that Christ hath not a personal being at Gods right hand.*

Chr. Doth not the Scripture say, That the same Jesus that went away, shall in like manner come again? *Acts* 1. 10, 11.

Quak. *I deny he shall ccome visibly; and though it be said in like manner, yet every like is not the same*, Whitehead, Ibid. p. 22.

Chr. Is not this a plain denial of the second personal coming of Christ?

Quak. *They are like to be deceived, who are expecting that Christs second coming will be* a personal coming; *which word* person *you add to the Scriptures, not minding the penalty*, Revel. 22. G. Whitehead, *Ibid. p.* 23.

Chr. 'Tis said, When he comes, that every eye shall see him, they that peirced him, &c.

Quak. *To say, They that pierced* that Body, *shall see* that Body, *are not Scripture words, but added; you do herein shew your carnal expectations, mean thoughts, unscriptural conceptions of Christ; where doth*

doth the Scripture say, That Christ shall come in Person? G. Whitehead, *Ibid. p.* 21, 22.

Chr. In one breath you confess, That *Christ rose with the same Body that was crucified*, and that he ascended into Glory, *Ibid. p.* 17. And in another you speak thus, *To say Christ ascended with the same body which rose from the dead, and is at Gods right hand with that body; and that he hath a personal being at Gods right hand you cannot believe*, Ibid. p. 17, 18. Who is able to reconcile these Contradictions? In which of your sayings shall we believe you, 'tis evident, you did but dissemble in the first, that you might entrap and deceive your unwary Reader.

But if Christ's *second coming* will not be *personal*, pray tell us what you mean by his second coming?

Quak. *Be sober, and hope to the end, for the grace that shall be brought to you at the Revelation of Jesus Christ, when he shall appear* in you *glorified, who before was crucified in weakness, but now is raised in Power*, G. Keith. Im. Re. p. 77.

Chr. If this be the second appearance and coming of Christ, as in your Book 'tis called, pray what is the first coming?

Quak. *Till that time the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts; he directs them to a light that shineth in a dark place, which is* the same Jesus Christ in his first appearance, *as the seed sown, a seed of light, but not come forth to the perfect day; this is the most sure and firm word of Prophesie, whereunto we do well to take heed for the time*, Keith. Ibid.

Chr. Then Christ's coming in the form of a Servant to suffer and die, was no coming at all; for his *first appearance you say is the light that shineth in a dark place*; and the second is, when he (*that* is,

is in his appearance) shall in you be glorified, so that *a personal coming* in any respect is manifestly denied by you. And since you deny Christ in his personal Being and Existence, pray tell me, Hath he no Body?

Quak. Yea, the Church is his Body, Edw. Burroughs.

Chr. What do you mean by the Church, is it Persons, or onely a Seed, or Spirit in Men?

Quak. 'Tis the Seed.

Chr. Where is such a Seed call'd the Body of Christ, do you believe Christ hath no other Body but this?

Quak. It is not our wonted course to say Christ hath no Body but his Church, but we say the Church is his Body, Burroughs Works, p. 150.

Chr. Why do you not speak directly, Hath Christ no other Body but his Church?

Quak. This is an ensnaring question, I shall not answer to satisfie thee, nor may I feed thy Serpents Wisdom, Burroughs, Ibid.

Chr. What snare can be in this question, if you do indeed believe that Christ hath another Body.

Quak. To say Christ hath two Bodies, one out of the sight of the Saints; *there is so much wickedness and ignorance in the Broachers of such a particular, that it needs no answer*, Burroughs, Ibid. 151, 152.

Chr. Then *Burroughs* and *G. Whitehead* both agree in denying Christ to have a Body distinct from his Church.

Quak. Them that accuse us for saying Christ hath but one Body, *should produce Scripture that saith he* hath two; *and where doth the Scripture say, That Christs glorified Body in heaven is of a humane nature*, G. Whiteheads Apolog. p. 33.

Chr.

Chr. 'Tis apparent then, you acknowledge no other Christ but the light in you; this, and this only is the very person of Christ in your judgment.

Quak. *They who deny Christ to be the light in every man are Antichrists*, Burroughs, Ibid. p. 127.

Chr. But is the very Person of Christ in every man?

Quak. *The Gospel is preached in every Creature under heaven*, Whitehead, *Christ ascended*, p. 63.

Chr. I know by Gospel you mean Christ himself, but is Christ himself preach'd in *Devils*, *Beasts*, *Trees*, and in every *flagitious and wicked person*; yea, is Christ himself in every *Reprobate*?

Quak. *When we say* Christ is in Reprobates, *you must understand the* light or gift of Christ; *for we do not express the light in every man to be Christ*, George Whiteheads Apol. p. 35. *'Tis not our Principle to* say Christ is in every man; *'tis falshood to accuse us with affirming, that Christ is in every man*, Whitehead, *Christ ascended*, p. 66.

Chr. What vile hypocrisie and deceit is this *Whitehead* guilty of, he himself saith, The Scriptures direct to the Rule, *that is, the light within that gave them forth*, Christ ascended, p. 42. *Burroughs* affirms, *That they who deny Christ to be the light in every man are Antichrists.* But I would ask *Whitehead*, whether this light or gift *be created or increated*: If the former, then 'tis but *a meer creature*: If the latter, as he affirms in his *Dip. Pl. p.* 13. *To say the light within every man is a meer creature, is* (saith he) *contrary to plain Scripture*, which saith, In him was life, and the life was the light of men; *this life and light is divine and increated.* Is *Whitehead* then to be believed in saying, 'Tis not your Principle

Principle to say Christ is in every man, whilst he openly denies *the light within to be a creature*, and saith, *'Tis divine and increated:* This kind of saying and denying is so common with him, that I profess 'tis a very hard and difficult point with me to know when he speaks as he thinks; from the whole, you see I had just reason to accuse you for denying the person of Christ: But since you own the name *Christ*, and do make use of it, pray what doth it signifie?

Quak. *Christ signifies anointed.*

Chr. If God himself be Christ, *as Penn saith*, I would quere *whether God himself was anointed*: If you will dare to affirm this, then tell me by whom, with what, and to what end he was anointed.

Quak. *This we say, that Christ as the Son of God before the world, before he took Flesh*, was the anointed of God, *which anointing was spiritual, and spiritually received by the heavenly Birth, the anointed, the holy seed*, Whitehead, Christ ascended, p. 68.

Chr. This is still as much as to say, that *God himself was anointed*: If so, what was the unction, by whom powred upon him, and wherefore?

Quak. *Now thou obtrudes questions.*

Chr. Will you not speak intelligibly? Is it not necessary to understand who is the *Christ*, and wherefore he was *anointed*; what signifies your saying, The anointing was spiritual, and spiritually received by the heavenly birth, the holy seed? *Is God himself a heavenly Birth, did he receive the anointing?* pray be plain, and do not lurk in ambiguous terms, neither let us be put off with your blasphemous absurdities, but speak home to the point.

Quak. *Alas for thee, these are mysteries thy dark mind cannot conceive or understand.*

Chr.

Chr. Is it not your duty (*who pretend to be under infallible teachings*) to endeavour my information in such important and weighty matters.

Quak. *Wilt thou deny that the Son of God, before the world, before he took flesh, was the anointed of God.*

Chr. I do not deny, but really believe the *eternal Deity of the Son of God*; yet I do deny, that the meer *Godhead* of the Son was the anointed Saviour: And thou must prove, that the Son of God, *meerly as God*, is the Christ; for what thou hast yet said is no proof.

Quak. *Is not what I have said sufficient.*

Chr. In no wise; however thou mayst take time to consider on it, mean while let me ask thee, whether Christ was not Gods gift?

Quak. *Yea, he was so.*

Chr. To what end, and in what respect is he the gift of God?

Quak. *His Doctrine, Life, Miracles, Death and Sufferings to God, is the gift and expression of Gods eternal love for the salvation of men*, Penns Sand. Foun. p. 19.

Chr. Thou hast affirmed, That *God is Christ*; if so, *did God himself die, and suffer to God?* and therein express his love for the salvation of men; or if the *Son of God the heavenly Birth, which was before the world, and before he took flesh*, as Whitehead *talks*, be only the anointed Saviour; was this simply of it self given to die, and *suffer to God?* or if the meer light within be the Christ, will you say, This was given to die and suffer to God, and therein to express Gods eternal love for the salvation of men? who can understand these things? Are not such dictates apparent indications of your distracted minds?

Quak. *We say Christ is the gift of Gods eternal love for the salvation of men, and wilt thou deny this?*

Chr. Though I do grant it, yet I see you will take a liberty to say that at one time, and in one place, which can never be reconciled with your sayings in another, and that you run your selves into such *a labyrinth of confusion and contradiction*, that all the light you have cannot extricate you out of, and consequently that your pretences to *infallibility* is a meer lying delusion: For you neither consist with the truth, nor your selves; yet give me leave to ask you, whether one great end wherefore Christ was given, and came into the world, was not *to seek and to save such that were lost.*

Quak. *Yea, he came to seek and to save the lost.*

Chr. But who, or what is this that was lost.

Quak. *That which was lost, is still in mans heart, and there it must be sought; for it remains still in the house (that is) mans heart:* This *is the thing to be sought for.* This *Christ came to seek and save, and all his Ministers preach'd people to* this; the lost in man, *that it might be found*; a lost God, a lost Christ, *this was the sum and substance of their Doctrine*, G. Keith. Im. Re. p. 75, 76.

Chr. Blush O Heavens, and be astonish'd O Earth, was ever such a thing as this heard of before? that Jesus Christ came to seek and save *a lost God, a lost Christ*; was ever God and Christ in a lost condition? If you had said, That Jesus Christ came to seek and save Sinners who were in a lost condition, and to stir them up to seek after God, whom they had lost, you had spoken safely: But to say *this*, Christ came to seek and save, and all his Ministers preach'd people to *this*, the lost in man, *a lost God, a lost*

Christ; Is not capable of any construction less then blasphemy. To this agrees *James Nayler*, who said, Christ came to *redeem the seed within*, which he often calls *Christ*. Is this another of those things you say are necessary to be reveal'd to you, *which are not to be found in Scripture, not so much as by consequence*. And are these your instances to prove you under *immediate Inspirations*? If they be, they will prove no more, nor no less then this, that you are immediately *inspired and influenced by that grand Impostor the Devil*. Pray what is your Opinion concerning Justification by that Righteousness of Christ, which he in his own Person fulfil'd for us, wholly without us.

Quak. *Justification by the Righteousness which Christ fulfil'd for us in his own Person, wholly without us; we boldly affirm it to be a doctrine of Devils, and an arm of the Sea of corruption, which doth now deluge the World*, William Penn, *Apol. p.* 148.

Chr. Is there no other Righteousness by which the Saints are justified then what Christ works onely in them?

Quak. Thou Beast, *to whom the Plagues of God are due, and upon whom the wrath of God must be accomplish'd, who wouldst have another Righteousness then that which Christ works in the Saints*, Edw. Burroughs Works, p. 32.

Chr. Is not this to disclaim the Doctrine of Justification by an imputed Righteousness.

Quak. *Thou wrongst us, and our Principle, for imputative Righteousness, as truly consider'd in the Scriptures, we do not disclaim*, G. Whitehead Apol. P. 37.

Chr.

Chr. I have great reason to believe that *G. W.* dissembles in these words, for in the *same page* he disclaims them that deny *the Righteousness of Christ without for Justification*; and also saith, That *justification by the Righteousness of Christ without us* is not Scripture language; who will believe his complaint of wrong, whilst he so apparently confesseth the truth of what is objected against you, as will abundantly appear from what follows, what righteousness is that upon the account of which we are justified?

Quak. *Justification is not from the imputation of anothers Righteousness, but from the actual performing and keeping of Gods righteous Statutes*, Pen. Sand. Found. p. 25.

Chr. Is it not written, *Rom.* 5. 19. By the Obedience of One, many were made righteous?

Quak. *It is a great abomination to say*, God should condemn and punish his innocent Son, *that he having satisfied for our Sins, we might be justified by the imputation of his perfect Righteousness.* O why should this horrible thing be contended for by Christians? *Penn, Ibid. p.* 25. 30.

Chr. How now Mr. *Penn*, is the Doctrine of Christ's Sufferings for Sinners to make satisfaction to Divine Justice an horrible thing, and an abomination to you; do you consider what you say?

Quak. *This I do say, That the consequences of such a Doctrine is both irreligious and irrational*, Pen. Ibid. p. 16.

Chr. What then doth the Scripture intend, in saying Christ died for the ungodly, *Rom.* 5. And he *was made sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. *And on him was*

laid the Iniquities of us all, Isa. 53.

Quak. *I caution and warn men, by no means to entertain this principle* (of Christ's dying to make satisfaction to Divine Justice) *by whomsoever recommended*, Pen. Ibid.

Chr. Be free and plain with me, How and in what respect is Christ said to fulfil the Law, and to die for Sinners?

Quak. *He fulfil'd the Law* onely as our pattern or example, *Pen. Ibid. p.* 26. *Christ is so far from telling us of such a way of being justified, as that he informs us the reason why he abode in his Fathers love was his Obedience; he is so far from telling us of being justified by vertue of his Obedience imputed, that we less we keep the Commands, and obey for our selves* In all which Christ is but our example, *Pen. Ibid.*

Chr. But are men indeed justified by their own works?

Quak. *Was not* Abraham *justified by works*; *we must not conceive, as the dark imputations of this Age, that* Abrahams personal offering *was not a justifying Righteousness*, Pen. Ibid. p. 30.

Chr. Was not *Abraham* justified before he did personally offer up *Isaac?* yea, doth not the Scripture intimate, that *Abraham* was not justified by works, see *Rom.* 4. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. And do not you (Mr. *Penn*) elsewhere tell us, *That such are run into a narrow strait, who venture to reconcile Merit and Grace. See your caveat against Popery*, p. 12. *where you also say, That Grace is a free gift, requiring nothing*; and now ask, Was not *Abraham* justified by works, *and that good works may be said to procure, deserve, or obtain*

Apolog

Apolog. 198. Is this to write like an infallible Dictator? But do you really believe that *Abraham's offering personally* was his justifying Righteousness?

Quak. *I do say* Abraham *had not the imputation of anothers Righteousness to him, his personal Obedience was the ground of that just imputation*, Pen. Sand. Found. p. 30.

Chr. If *Abraham* was justified by works, as you argue, why did the Apostle onely take notice of his offering up of *Isaac*, and not of the whole course of his Obedience? If a man be justified by works before God, surely it cannot be by one *single action* (such as *Abrahams* offering was) but by a continued holy and innocent life. But is *our personal Obedience* the very ground and reason of Gods reckoning and accounting us righteous.

Quak. *I do maintain, that good works may be said to procure, deserve, or obtain; in which sense, without good works, there is no acceptance with God*; and *Abrahams* personal offering was the ground of that just imputation, *Penn.*

God accepts not any where there is any failing, or who do not fulfil the Law, and answer every demand of Justice, Edw. Burroughs, *supra*.

Chr. Then the ground of our rejoycing and acceptance, is not in and from the Righteousness of another, *viz.* of Christ imputed to us by Faith, but onely in a righteousness inherent in us, and done by us.

Quak. *The Doctrine of rejoycing and acceptance from the works of another is utterly excluded*, Pen. Sandy Found. p. 27.

Chr. Doth not this render the undertakings of *Jesus Christ*, as *a Mediatour and Surety*, a meer fancy? If the ground of a mans rejoycing be in himself, why doth the Apostle give it as the Character and property of a true Christian, *to rejoyce in Christ Jesus*, Phil. 3. And what signifie those words, *Christ is made unto us Righteousness, wherefore let him that glorieth, glory in the Lord*, 1 Cor. 1. 30, 31. And what did the Prophet *Isaiah* intend, *cap.* 45, 24, 25. *Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I Righteousness, in the Lord shall all the seed of* Israel *be justified, and shall glory.* Are we no farther concern'd in the Obedience and Sufferings of our Lord Jesus without us, then onely as our example or pattern?

Quak. *What more wouldst thou have? I have told thee, That Christ fulfil'd the Law but onely as our example.*

Chr. Do you not then notoriously *equivocate and dissemble*, when you say, That *Christs Birth, Blood, Offering, Death, Mediatourship, Covenant, his being Priest, Prophet, and King*, is owned according to the Scriptures, and all the Prophesies of him, *Innocency with open face*, p. 38. Is the owning of Christ onely as our example all that the Scriptures and Prophesies of him signifie; *Can you imitate him in his Mediatourship? can you lay down your lives, and take them up again? Have you the same fulness of the Godhead in you he had*, that you can follow him in the same Obedience? *Can you execute the Offices of Priest, Prophet, and King, in the same manner and perfection*, which Christ did and doth? We know very well, how ever you palliate, you believe no such thing that your words seem to import: For when you talk of *Christs Birth, Blood, Death*, &c.

you

you intend no more *but the light in you*, in its variety of manifestations; therefore if possibly thou canst, answer directly what that Righteousness is, which is reckoned or accounted to us for our Justification.

Quak. *Art thou of them, that imagine a Justification without Sanctification, who because the Scripture saith, God justifies the ungodly through Faith, they therefore conclude themselves justified in their ungodliness, by a fancy which they call Faith*, Naylors Love to the Lost, 50, 51. *I further tell thee, That Justification by an imputed Righteousness is both irrational, irreligious, ridiculous and dangerous*, Pen. Sand. Fo. p. 30, 31.

Chr. I know of none that hold Justification of persons *in their ungodliness*; this therefore is a wicked slander, and not at all to the question: We plead not for a Righteousness imputed, to overthrow a Righteousness inherent, or the exercise of Christian vertues; 'tis you would separate and divide them, not we: The question intends this, whether the person justified was not at that instant before he was justified guilty in himself?

Quak. *Justification goes not before, but is consequential to the mortifying of Lusts, and the sanctification of the Soul: Again, impute or imputing signifies no more in Scripture, but to express men really and personally to be what is imputed to them*, Pen. Sand. Fo. p. 27, 29, 39.

Chr. Doth not this import, that a man must be formally just before he be justified, for nothing is imputed or reckoned to us (according to your reasoning) but what is inherent in us: I would ask you, whether remission of sins be not one part of Justification?

Quak. *I suppose it may.*

Chr. Can one be forgiven that is not guilty; it looks like a contradiction, to pardon one that is innocent, to forgive one that owes nothing; certainly he that is pardoned must be a Sinner, *Rom.* 4. 5. that is, such that were so till justified, not such that remain so being justified.

Q. *God justifies the living, and not the dead, whilst the Just being dead in trespasses and sins: There is no justification where the Just lives not, for by that which the Just lives, is that by which the creature is justified,* Naylors Love to the lost, 52. *Printed* 1656.

Chr. To talk of the *Just being dead in trespasses and sins*, is no other then your absurd blasphemous and ridiculous canting. For *by Just*, we know you mean *the seed of God* in man, which sometimes you call *Christ*, *or his appearance*, *gift or measure*: But is *Christ*, or his *Seed* or *Power* in man, *dead in sins and trespasses?* what unworthy and vile Creatures are you to suggest such perillous conceits as these, and yet pretend to infallibility and perfection; by what hath been said, I am (and presume others may be) fully satisfied what kind of Justification you hold: Pray let us understand your Opinion of Sanctification, what it is:

Quak. *'Tis Christ himself; hence we conclude, To say Sanctification is imperfect in this life, is as much as to say, Christ is imperfect; but Christ is perfect, therefore Sanctification is perfect: See then the error and wickedness of this principle, that Sanctification is imperfect*, Edw. Burrough's Works 488.

Chr. 'Tis true, *Jesus Christ by his Spirit* is the Author and Worker of Sanctification; but will it therefore follow, that the work of Sanctification

in

in us is *Christ himself*, or that this work is now perfect in all its degrees.

Quak. Jesus Christ *is both the seeds-man, the seed, and also the fruit*, G. Keith. Im. R. p. 77. *The Law in the mind is* the Spirit of God: *To say the Law in the mind is imperfect, is error in the highest degree; this is an abominable corrupt principle of error, the new man is perfect peace, and perfect sanctification*, Burroughs, Ibid. 488.

Chr. How wilt thou prove that *Christ is both the Author, and the work, the seeds-man, and the seed, and fruit?* That the Law in the mind is the *Spirit it self*, and *Christ himself*; and that the new man is perfect sanctification, that there remains not the least sin either for kind or degree in the person sanctified; we will not be imposed upon, therefore, if you can, demonstrate this thing unto us.

Quak. *If the old man, the body of sin, remain in sanctified persons, then none are sanctified at all; and such as have the body of sin in them, have no part in the Kingdom of God*, Edw. Burroughs, Ibid. 488.

Chr. Why then doth the Apostle exhort sanctified persons to put off the old man, *Col.* 3. 5. *Rom.* 13. 12, 13.

And how will you prove your selves to have any part in the Kingdom of God, since 'tis notorious, the body of sin yet remains in the best of you, of which your *intollerable pride, error, envy, malice, railing cursing, hypocrisie, and wilful lying* are sufficient evidences.

Quak. *We deny the old man, we are in the meekness, truth, and simplicity; therefore thou suggest nothing but thy own imaginations.*

Chr. You are (as we say) far from your Neighbours,

bours, who else will say so of you besides your selves, your own Testimony is not sufficient in this case; especially since your Writings, Converse, and Practise *gives the lye* to this your pretence, and sufficient instances hath in this Discourse been suggested to prove you guilty; therefore your denial is an aggravation of your sin and wickedness. But to the question, doth Sanctification consist in our conformity to the will of God or not?

Quak. *Now thou runs into the many words, thy fleshly and imaginary distinctions.*

Chr. When wilt thou forbear these trifling Impertinencies, Speak to the point.

Quak. *I have told thee, That the Law in the mind* is the Spirit of God, *and that Christ is Sanctification, can I speak more plain?*

Chr. If the Law in the mind be the *Spirit it self*, and if Sanctification *be Christ himself*, what must we call obedience *to Christ, his Law or Spirit?* If our habitual and actual conformity to the divine Law or Rule be our holiness, how can *the Spirit it self* and *Christ himself* meerly be it?

Quak. *We deny not, but declare, That all men ought to be obedient to the light*, Christ *in them.*

Chr. But may this obedience be call'd *our holiness?* you seem to deny it, in saying *Christ himself is Sanctification*, and the *Law in the mind* is the *Spirit of God*: Dost *Christ obey himself, doth he repent and believe*, and is his *obeying himself in us* our holiness? If so, then whilst you deny an imputed Righteousness in a Scripture sense, you maintain *a righteousness imputed in an enthusiastical and ridiculous sense.* But if you will say, That obedience to the divine Rule is our holiness, then you will contradict your selves. And to apply it to you, I would ask, How it

is

is possible for you to prove your selves *sanctified persons*, that so wilfully and wickedly oppose *the rule of duty*: Did ever any holy man deliberately affirm, *That is no command to me which is a command to another, neither did any of the Saints act by the command which was given to another; they every one obey'd his own command*, Burroughs, Ibid. p. 47. Then that Law which forbids *Idolatry*, *Adultery*, *Murder*, *Theft*, *and bearing false witness*, &c. is no Law to you, forasmuch as it was given to others, and you say, We are not to act *by the command which was to another*; no wonder you pay so little respect *to Parents*, *Magistrates*, *Masters*, &c. for that you will say was a command to others, therefore no command to you; so that neither the affirmative, nor the negative Precepts have any obligation upon you; for you have a peculiar dispensation, onely to obey your own command? Are you not, oh ye Quakers, ashamed of this Doctrine?

Quak. By order and authority given me by the Spirit of the living God, on the 31 day of the 10th moneth, 1655. about four a Clock in the morning, *The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Write my controversie with all the Inhabitants of the Earth. Hence I do say, That to take up a command from the Letter, and say Christ commands it, that thus you are in the witchcrafts*, Edw. Burroughs works, p. 96. *comp. with* p. 105.

Chr. Is it witchcraft to stand in awe of Christ's commands, to reverence their authority, to endeavour to our utmost an observance thereof? Did ever such ungodly and irreverent Speeches drop from the mouth or pen of any truly Christian man? And is it not *impiously horrid*, to make *God himself to patronize such blasphemies*; why do you countenance

nance such Novices? Are you not yet ashamed of those Testimonies you have given to this most profane Scribler? And whereas you say, That no-thing *is a command to me which is a command to another*; will you stand by it, that nothing is a duty to me but what I am immediately mov'd unto by the power within me?

Quak. *'Tis an error to say, we are not to wait for an inward call, motion, impulse, or inspiration, to preach, pray, or to give thanks, so as to forbear till it be given*, G. Keith. Im. Rev. Preface.

Chr. Am I not then sinless, if I omit the doing of any thing that may be good in it self, and commanded in the Scriptures, if I be not immediately moved thereunto?

Quak. *Is it of good report*, for unregenerate and uninspired men to pray, *Pen.* Apol. p. 111. *Spiritual obedience is not that wherein men and women read the Scriptures, and from that set themselves on work, and so make an imitation of obedience*, Naylors Love to the lost, p. 27.

People cry out of their best duties, as having sin in them, had they not better let them alone: All these holy duties, as they call them, must down; had they not better let them alone, and see the salvation of God, and come to the gift, &c.

Chr. These last words, *One of our Ministry was moved to declare very lately in a publick meeting in* London. But is not this to teach men to be *irreligious and profane*; no marvel *Nicholas Lucas* said, We may *burn the Bible*, and serve God as well without it: But the question returns upon you, whether this be not to lay all our neglects of doing that which is meet; yea, ought to be done, upon

the

the power or Spirit, for not immediately moving us thereunto? *And* what is your meaning, when you say *these holy duties must down*, and we had better let them alone, as having sin in them: Is it not this? *That there is no duty incumbent upon imperfect creatures?* and that none must be perform'd, *except it be perfect in the matter, manner, principle, and end*: If so, are not all men discharg'd by you, from acknowledging the Soveraignty of God in those Laws he hath given unto them.

Quak. You are not dead with Christ, who are yet subject unto Ordinances, Burroughs p. 105. *Your Obedience is but the conformity in your own wills to that which was the will of God to another*, Ibid.

Chr. The Spirit of God in the Scriptures assures us, that they who are subject to, and keep the Commandments of God, are the Children of God, and they who do not are lyars, *see the first Epistle of Joh.* 2, 3, 4. *cap.* 5. 2, 3. Yet this wicked man saith, That they who are subject to Ordinances are not dead with Christ, if you flee for refuge to *Col.* 2, 20. It will not relieve you, for it is no ways applicable to the persons to whom *Edw. Burroughs* did write, nor is his Speech limited to Jewish Ordinances (now abolished) *but was more general, respecting the Ordinances of Christ still in force and being*, and will you say these are not to be owned nor subjected unto, but onely so far as we are immediately moved and prompted by the power within.

Quak. To go without the movings of the Spirit in your own wills, God hates, and his wrath is upon if the movings of the Spirit do not carry forth to all them, they are accursed of God. And all who go before the movings of it to carry forth, All their Prayers, Preach-

ings,

ings, and Ordinances I deny, and declare against, by the eternal Spirit of God, that they are odious, and abomination unto God, whether they be done in private, or in the Church, *Edw. Burroughs* Works, p. 47, 48.

Chr. Then we are really acquitted from any fault in omitting to do that which is good, and all the blame why it is not done, *must be laid upon the Spirit*: But is not this horrid? will this plea be of any service to us (think you) in the day of account to say *Lord, though I knew such a thing ought to have been done, and such an evil omitted; and that thou in the holy Scriptures did command the one, and forbid the other, yet that was nothing to me, I had no immediate motion or impulse to do that, or forbear this.* But what if one be moved to do those things which are not commanded in the Scriptures, must that motition be followed?

Quak. We affirm, That a great many particular things, both by way of precept, prohibition, permission, approbation and counsel from the Lord, *are both reveal'd, and necessary to be reveal'd to us, which are not* essentials of the Christian Religion, nor principles of the Doctrine of Christ, *but things relating to our conversation in the world, and walking with God, with faith and comfort, according to his will, with the knowledg of which we are to be fill'd with in all things.*

For there is a necessity for those under the New Covenant dispensation *of living in, and walking after the Spirit, to have things reveal'd to them from the Lord*, which are not to be found in the Scriptures particularly, not so much as by consequence, G. K. Im. Rev. p. 3, 4.

Chr. If I may be so bold as to ask you, what are some of those things which by way of *precept or counsel from the Lord*, which, you say, are necessary

to

to be reveal'd to you, which yet *are not to be found in the Scriptures, not so much as by consequence*: And how are you assured you have them from the Lord? and what evidence (*more then your own pretences*) can you give thereof to other men? Is *your Friends*, being moved to *go naked*, both *men and women*, *openly in the Streets* one of those things? And is the casting off *the duties of Relations* each to other, yea *the relation it self*, another? As I knew one of your Friends was moved to ramble about the Countrey, and neglect her Family at home; and once when she return'd, it was upon her heart to signifie to her Husband (*an honest, sober, and religious man, but no Quaker*) *That if he were free, he might take him another woman:* I confess these things are not to be found in the Scriptures, not so much as by consequence: Do you call this a living in, and walking after the Spirit? Is it not rather a following the conduct of the Prince of the power of the air? Again, what if one of you be moved to do or speak any thing which others of you are not satisfied in, must they obey that motion?

Quak. *That single person must deny his motion, wherein it differs from the judgment of the Body* (that is to say, the Court) *which hath a true sense, feeling, and understanding of motions, visions, revelations and doctrines*; therefore 'tis safest to make her the touchstone in all things relating unto God, *Spir of the Hat*, p. 21.

Chr. Is not this as much as to say, that the power or spirit in and with the body is the only *infallible and unerring rule*, and not the power or measure (as you sometimes call it) in any individual person? are you now after all your clamours about the sufficiency of the light or power in every man to be

the

the rule, come to set up the light and spirit in the body above it?

Quak. *Either there is such a thing as a Christian-society, sometimes call'd a visible body, or there is not:* If there be, *then this Church either hath power or not;* if no power, then no Church: *If a Body or Church, then there must be a power within it self to determine,* Penns Spirit of Alexander, p. 9.

Chr. For Christians to plead this, who own the Scriptures for their rule, and not the meer light within, the argument may safely be allowed: But for you who tell us, *That is no command to me which is a command to another, and every one must act from their own command,* and the light in every man is his only unerring rule: I see not how you can urge this, and yet consist with your selves. But in case one should forbear what the Body would have done, or do what they forbid, what then?

Quak. *We abhor, renounce, and rebuke with severity that rude imagination of the Hat on in publick Prayer: In this case the Body may admonish, and if the Party remain tenacious, disown him as a Disputer about needless questions, and one that is gone out of the compleat union of the Body, and exercised by another Spirit,* Penns Spirit of Alex. p. 4. 9.

Chr. Though others may, yet you cannot *(if you will agree with your selves)* stand by this: For will you say, What a man doth without an inward motion is *accursed,* and yet will you disown that man for not doing what he is not moved unto; will you say, *There continually attends you that spirit that immediately informs you of your words, thoughts, and deeds, and gives you true directions what to do, and what to leave undone,* Penns Apol. p. 138. And now

tak

talk of a Body that hath power in it self to determine, do you not herein render your selves justly ridiculous and contemptible in opposing that in others which yet you contend for amongst your selves? And do you think this is the way to gain credit with any, whilst you play fast and loose, affirm and deny at pleasure? how can you impose that on another as his duty, *which the light in him discovers not so to be*? And how dare you deny such, and call them *unruly Beasts*, and Ranting spirits, who meerly for the want of an inward motion forbear such a practice? How you can do this, (*your opinion that the light within is the only rule being considered*) I cannot understand; If you will say that there is a known rule, and standard to walk by, and this is not the meer light in every man, but another thing, to which that light must yield, and also tell us what that rule is, *whether the Scriptures, or, the Power in the body*. If you say either of these, you deny your first principle: If you affirm the latter onely, then you do but run from one extream to another, yea hopp out of the Frying-pan into the fire; *If to take up a Command from the Scriptures, be (by you) accounted witchcraft*? pray, what shall we call a taking up a command from the Body?

But since you seem to be so zealous for the Ministry, will you be pleased to acquaint us what is the true Ministery?

Qu. *In the new Covenant, God is the teacher of his people himself Immediatly by his Immediate Spirit, power, and unction within*, G. Whit. *Christ ascend.* 64.

Chr. If so; wherefore were *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastours, Teachers* given and set in the *Church*, for the work of the Ministry? And why do you set up a ministry amongst your selves? *Is it be-*

cauſe you are not under the new Covenant? If God by his Immediat power and Spirit within, be the teacher, why do you appoint your Miniſters before hand to ſpeak in ſuch a place, at ſuch a time? And how know you, Such a one ſhall be Immediately moved then, and not another inſtead of him? And when you invite others to your ſilent meetings, telling us they will be ſuch, How are you aſſured that thoſe you invite may not be moved to ſpeak in that meeting? In a word, wherefore do you meet at all? will not the power move you, unleſſe you be at ſuch a meeting? None of theſe things will agree with your poſition, therefore one of your friends, was (in this) ſo far ingenuous as to acknowledg that your meetings were only, and principally to encourage (*that is, to Decoy, Trappan, and Inveagle*) others. But before I leave this queſtion, give me leave to ask you, Who, or What it is that is taught?

Qu. I am a witneſs of the moſt high God, a Miniſter of the word of life, commanded by the eternal Spirit into this work, for the ſeeds ſake, *which is not of the world, And to the gathering* of it *into the fold of everlaſting peace.* Edw. Burroughs works p. 106.

Chr. Is nothing elſe taught, and to be taught, but only this ſeed?

Qu. *To the mind which is carnal, which rules in you, the commands of Chriſt are not given, nor can be received,* Burroughs ibid. 106. *The great work of the Miniſtry is to point hearers to this (that is the ſeed) in them.* G. Keith. Im. R. p. 77. 78.

Chr. What muſt we underſtand by this Seed?

Qu. *That of God in thee, and in every man, the witneſs of God in thy Conſcience* 'tis that we ſpeak unto.

Chr. I

Chr. Is not this seed witness, or measure, Christ the light in man?

Qu. *It is so; The Apostles preached Christ crucifyed every where, and pointed them to him, Crucifyed in them*, Keith ibid. 75,76.

Chr. Is the command of God onely given to, and obeyed by this Seed?

Qu. *The Spirit, both as a rule manifests the promise, exerciseth faith in, and fulfills the promises.* G. Whitehead, Christ ascend. p. 10.

Chr. Is the Spirit of promise both the Rule, and the Subject?

Qu. *I have told thee, To the mind which is carnal the commands of Christ are not given; And that the Spirit, not only as a Rule manifests the promises, but exerciseth faith.*

Chr. Then your Ministry is onely *God preaching to himself, giving rules to himself, and obeyed onely by himself.* Will you prate of your Infallibility, and yet talk like mad-men? Had you not lost your common reason, and were absolutely infatuated, you would not dictate after this manner: is it not high time for you to renounce these follies that are so apparently manifest? or will you choose (*rather than to take shame to your selves*) to persist in your errors to your utter undoing? Be advised, before it be too late: think not, that because you are under the bewitching influence of your own self-flattery, that therefore all is well: you must passe under another Judgment than your own: though you will wickedly take upon you *to adjudg others to their eternal state*, yet you will find, that neither them, nor your selves, shall be determined by your judgments.

If any of you are offended with me, for opposing the *Christian* to the *Quaker*; let them know, I cannot,

I dare not, write contrary to my own light and Judg-
ment: I do not believe *a true Quaker* (such as these be-
fore quoted) *is a Christian*; but on the contrary, do
look upon them as the most implacable enemies to the
Christian religion, that these days have brought forth.
How can I think otherwise, since you deny *the Person*
of Christ, And all your talk of redemption by him,
issues only in this; *He redeems himself*. Your *Idle non-*
sensical, and blasphemous prating, of God teaching
the seed, that is to say, *himself in man*, renders you to
me, to be men *Inspired by Satan*. That you do but
mock and delude men, when you talk of the *Covenant*
of grace, is evident; for you understand it not, But o-
penly maintain *a Covenant of works*. *For you affirm*
that God accepts not any who do not fulfill the law, and
answer every demand of Justice. And render all that
Jesus Christ did for us, without us, no more but a mere
example; If we ask you concerning your opinions.
Presently we are call'd *Reprobates* and judg'd to be
the *sorcery and witchcraft*; let us urge you to be
plain, you put us off with *your witnessings*; if in one
place you seem to own the truth, in another, you
will in down-right terms deny it: *let this be signified to*
you, Then Immediately you curse us, so that no man
knows when, nor how to believe you, If we speak
you, to a single person, you reprove us for not using
the *pure language*. If we say *thou* to an Individual
Quaker; you will upbraid us with *Jeering or hypocri-*
sie: you bid us follow the light within us; And if we
do so, you will load us, with most bitter revilings, you
will Appropriate to your selves the priviledge of In-
fallibility, and at as if you were unaccountable either
to God, or man, for what you say, or do. Though your
sentiments, neither agree with *the Scriptures*, your
selves

selves, nor *the common reason of mankind*; yet will you Impose upon us, and *that under the severest censures*, the belief of your unknown, and *unintelligible doctrines*. You are as *vile Impostors* as ever were; for you will insinuate your *lying doctrines*, with *lyes*, perswade many credulous, and ignorant (yet welmeaning) people, that you indeed believe, *what in truth you do not*: And accuse your Adversaries of that, *wherein they are innocent*: your manner is not, to convince us of error, *but to conclude us so, right or wrong*. If any miscarriage be, that must be improved to make the truth it self odious: neither do you only undermine religion, but *your principles Improved* are destructive to all humane society: you tell us, *'tis witchcraft to take up a command from the Scriptures*, And *that is no command to me, which is a command to another*. If then a *father* command his child, The *child* may reply *Thou must wait for my obedience till I be moved*. The like may every subject and servant plead. If a *merchant sell you his goods*, He must stay for his money, *till you be moved to pay it*, til which time, you are under *no obligation in point of duty*: you say 'tis necessary to have things reveal'd to you *with respect to your conversation in the world*, which are not to be found in the Scriptures, no not by consequence; How then may your creditors be assured, it will be reveal'd to you, to pay what you owe them. *Scripture, and reason would, and do, teach you herein*, but these you must be dead unto; who knows then what may, or may not be reveal'd to you? 'Tis not unknown, that *a Revelation hath been pretended, to excuse the payment of a just debt*. And why may not that which hath been (*even amongst you*) be again? But is it reasonable that men should be baffled out of their just rights, *by such un-*

unjuſt and wicked pretences, go on, yet aſſuredly know that God will bring you to judgment. Then you ſhall know (though now you will not) by whom ſuch doctrines as theſe (*that are and have been the peſt, and plague of the world, and the ſcandal and reproach of religion*,) were Inſpired. Theſe things being conſidered, whether you be not either diſtracted or worſe, I ſhall leave with others to think on; in the mean while I judg my ſelf ſufficiently warranted in oppoſing the Chriſtian to the Quaker.

T.H

Th

The Subſtance of the Quakers *Belief in the Points before diſcourſed, compriz'd in this enſuing Catechiſm, for the more eaſie remembrance of ſuch, who are of weaker capacities.*

Queſt. WHat is your opinion of the Scriptures?

A. That they are neither a rule to us, nor a means to know God, nor how to worſhip him. *G. Whitehead.*

Thou mayſt burn thy Bible, and ſerve God as well without. *N. Lucas.*

Qu. *Is there any thing more made known to you, than what is revealed in the Scriptures?*

A. There is a neceſſity for thoſe under the new Covenant, to have things reveal'd to them which are not to be found in the Scriptures particularly, not ſo much as by conſequence. *G. Keith.*

Q. *Are we not to obey the commands in the Scriptures?*

A. They who take up a command from the letter, and ſay Chriſt commands it, are in the witchcraft. *Ed. Burroughs.*

Q. *May we not pray for thoſe mercies we want, and give thanks for mercies received, except we have an Immediate motion, and Impulſe to do it?*

A. 'Tis an error to ſay, We are not to wait for an inward call, motion, Impulſe or Inſpiration; to pray or give thanks, ſo, as to forbear till it be given. *Geo. Keith.*

Q. *If I never be moved to pray*, &c. *am I not excused?*

A. Is it of good report for un-inspired men to pray? *W. Pen.*

Q. *Will you say, tis of evil report if they doe?*

A. What thou doſt without an inward motion is accurſed. *Edw. Burroughs.*

All thoſe duties that have ſin in them, had better be let alone.

Q. *If the want of an Inward and Immediate motion will excuſe us from duty, what ſignifies the Law, which God hath given to man to oblige him thereunto?*

A. That is no command, (*or Law*) to me, which is given to another man. *Edw. Burrows.*

Q. *Are not all men ſinleſs, except, when they obey not an inward motion?*

A. I have told thee, that they who take up a command from the letter are in the witchcraft. *Ed. Bur.*

Q. *God rules the Stars by his Immediate power, they being not capable of being govern'd by any other rule; and if God do only govern, and rule man by immediate motions, wherein doth a Man differ from a Star?*

A. Now thou runs into the imaginations.

Q. *Either God hath given a rule to man or not, and this rule is known, or 'tis not? If there be a known rule, then either it obligeth at all times, or but at ſome; if the former, man alwayes ſins if he obeys not; if the latter, aſſign thoſe times when he is under no rule.*

A. I think not meet to ſatisfie thy buſie mind.

Q. *If inward motions, impulſes, or inſpirations be the onely rule, to every Individual; why do you ſet up a court amongſt your ſelves, to give rules to others?*

A. We being a religious Body have a power within our ſelves, *W. Pen Sp. Alex. p. 6.*

Q. *By*

Q. *By what rule shall I be assured of that?*

A. We as a believing body, have the holy Spirit, we know we are of God, and the world that withstand our testimony are in the Gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity, *W. P. ibid.* 13.

Q. *Is not this to justifie what is said of you? they that will not believe your sayings, you will not spare to censure them: but do not you herein apparently set up the Judgment of the Body above the Light within?*

A. We deny that to be Light which opposeth the the Judgment of the body *W. P. ibid.* 14. The body will have a true sense, feeling and understanding, of motions, visions, revelations, and doctrines; therfore 'tis safest to make her the touchstone in all things relating to God, *Sp. of the Hat*, p. 21.

Q. *What safety can there be in relying on such a body, that act by no known rule or law?*

A. We have the power: And will not such that are in the power do right? *ibid.*

Q. *By what known rule, do you exert your power, that so the peccant person may be convinced you do him no wrong?*

A. We, as a Body, have power to determine, therfore we abhor, renounce, rebuke, with all severity, that rude imagination of the Hat on in publick Prayer. *W. Pen Sp. of Alex.* p. 4, 5.

Q. *You take that for granted which is denied, how do you make it appear you have such a power?*

A. Thou art angry, not that there is a rule, but that thou hast no share in it, *W. Pen Sp. of Alex.* p. 4.

Q. *Is not this as much as to say, that the will and pleasure of the Elders is the rule, and not the light within: if so, what signifies all your contests, about the suffisiency of the light in every man?*

A. I

A. I have told thee that we know we are of God, and they who withstand our Testimony are in the gall of bitterness, *W. Pen.*

Q. *If your pretences be sufficient to determine other persons, why may not the like pretence in them determine you? If you urge the Scriptures or primitive practice for your rule, you will entangle your selves. If you say, The body (or court) is the rule, then you set up the body both above the Scriptures, and the light within. Will not a little measure of light discover your folly herein?*

I shall proceed to another question: Who or what is Jesus Christ?

A. 'Tis God himself *W. Pen.* 'Tis the light in us *Nayler and Hubberthorn.*

Q. *It is said that Jesus Christ was crucifyed: but is it safe to say, God himself or the Light within was crucifyed?*

A. We have condemned, and kill'd the just, that is, Christ Jesus in their hearts; him they crucifyed in his appearance, *G. Keith.*

Q. *Is Christ one thing, and his Appearance another?*

A. Yea: For Christ as he is and lives, in himself cannot be crucifyed, but his appearance may, *G. Keith.*

Q. *When the Scriptures speak of Christ crucifyed, do they mean onely his appearance, and not Himself? and is this meaning so?*

A. Yea.

Q. *Why do you speak, and write so darkly and doubtfully of the person of Christ?*

A. You are not able to bear what we have to hold forth concerning Him: should we deliver what we hold concerning Jesus Christ, we should be stoned in the

the ſtreets, *Rob. Waſtfield.*

Q. *What think you of that Chriſt, who was born at* Bethlem, *and dyed at* Jeruſalem *?*

A. Jeſus Chriſt at *Jeruſalem, a type, figure, a ſhaddow, that is paſt away.* Do you, when you riſe in the morning, think on God; do you ſee God in every creature and in your ſelf: think on theſe things *and trouble not your ſelf about Jeſus at* Jeruſalem. [*This was uttered before many credible witneſſes, by an eminent Quaker.*]

Q. *Is not Jeſus Chriſt a diſtinct perſon without you ?*

A. Jeſus Chriſt a perſon without us, is not Scripture-language, but the *Anthropomorphits*, and *Muggletonians*: *G. Whitehead.*

Q. *Is not Chriſt in perſon at Gods right hand ?*

A. Jeſus Chriſt is at Gods right hand, but I cannot believe he hath a perſonal Being at the right hand of God, *G. W.*

Q. *What do you intend by Gods right hand ?*

A. Chriſt, nor Gods right hand, is not to be limited to a remoteneſs from the Saints, *G. W.*

Q. *What is the meaning of that text, The ſame Jeſus that went away, ſhall in like manner come again,* Acts 1. 10, 11.

A. I deny he ſhall come viſibly, and though it be ſaid [in like manner,] yet every like is not the ſame, *G. Whitehead.*

Q. *Do not you believe that Chriſt will come the ſecond time without ſin to Salvation ?*

A. He is come the ſecond time.

Q. *'Tis true: Chriſt is come by his Spirit but is there not another Coming ?*

A. What other Coming wouldſt thou have?

Q. *The*

Q. The Scriptures ſpeak of his Coming to judg both the quick and the dead: do you beleive this?

A. Why doſt thou trouble thy ſelf about ſuch fooliſh and filly things;

Q. Pray, anſwer directly, whether you believe Chriſt ſhall come to judge the quick and the dead?

A. I perceive that which troubles thee is the puzling thy ſelf ſo much in that book (*the Bible*) thou wilt never be ſettled till thou throw away that Book.

Q. Do you deny the ſecond perſonal Coming of Chriſt?

A. They are like to be deceived who are expecting that Chriſts ſecond Coming will be perſonal *G. Whitehead.*

Q. What ſignifies thoſe words, When he comes every eye ſhall ſee him, they that peirced him &c?

A. To ſay, they, that peirced that body, ſhall ſee that body, are not Scripture-words. *G. Whitehead.*

Q. Hath Chriſt no body?

A. Yea, the Church is his body, *Ed. Burroughs.*

Q. Hath Chriſt no other body but his Church?

A. This is an enſnaring queſtion, *Ed. Bur.*

Q. What ſnare can be in it, if you beleive he hath another Body?

A. To ſay, Chriſt hath two bodies, one out of the ſight of the Saints, there is ſo much wickedneſs, and ignorance in the broachers hereof, that it needs no anſwer, *Edw. Burroughs.*

Q. Is not this as much as to ſay, Chriſt hath no other Body but his Church?

A. They that accuſe us for ſaying, Chriſt hath but one body, ſhould produce plain Scripture that ſaith, he hath two, *G. W.*

Q. Is there no other Chriſt but the Light within?

A. I

A. I have already ſaid that they who deny Chriſt to be the light in every man, are Antichriſts, *Ed. Bur.*

Q. What doth the word Chriſt ſignifie?

A. Anointed;

Q. If the light be Chriſt, what is its Unction? and to what end is it anointed? and how may we conceive it capable to execute the office of a Prieſt, Prophet, and King?

A. Now thou runs into thy fleſhly Conceivings;

Q. Is Chriſt in you, in reſpect of that nature in which he ſuffered at Jeruſalem?

A. Here thou Enemy of Chriſt wouldſt know how the Saints injoy Chriſt. Thou art in the nature that *Judas* was in, who betrayed him, *Ed. Burroughs.*

Q. Doth Chriſt, really in theſe days, take upon him the form of a Servant.

A. Thou dark beaſt, and conjurer, querying with thy conjured words: Is Chriſt to be limitted to days, in taking upon him the form of a ſervant? *Ed. Bur.*

Q. Is this anſwer ſerious and to the queſtion?

A. Yea, bleſſed be the Lord; 'tis an anſwer in the eternal life and light. *Ed. Burroughs.*

Q. Is it not Impious, to intitle God to ſuch railing and impertinent Anſwers?

A. Thou ſhalt eternally witneſs them. *Ed. Bur.*

Q. Was Jeſus Chriſt the gift of God?

A. He was ſo.

Q. Wherein doth that appear?

A. His doctrine, life, miracles, death and ſufferings to God, is the gift and expreſſion of God's eternal love for the ſalvation of men. *W. Pen.*

Q. Thou haſt affirmed, that God is Chriſt, did then God himſelf dye, and ſuffer to God? &c.

A. Wilt thou deny that Chriſt is God's gift?

Q. Wilt

Q. *Wilt thou prove that God gave himself to dye and suffer to God, therein to express his eternal love for the salvation of men?*

A. This a captious and ensnaring question.

Q. *I perceive thou art entangled, and it will be to little purpose to press thee to reconcile one dictate with another: however, pray shew, wherein Christ was given for the salvation of men?*

A. 1. In abolishing the other Covenant which consisted of shaddowy Ordinances.

2. In promulgating his message of a most free, and universal tender of Life to all that believe, and follow him the Light, in all his righteousness.

3. In seconding his Doctrine with signs and miracle, and a most innocent and a holy life.

4. In ratifying and confirming all with great love, and a holy resignation, by offering up his body to be crucified by wicked hands; and is thereby become a most compleat Captain and perfect Example. *W. Pen, Sad. Found.*

Q. *Of what were those Ordinances shaddows?*

A. Of the Light and Life.

Q. *Was not the light and life, at that time in the Jews?*

A. Yea, but not in that measure and degree, as afterwards should be.

Q. *Were they then shaddows onely of such a measure or degree as in future times should be vouchsafed?*

A. Figures and shaddows are onely in force till the substance comes. *W. Pen.*

Q. *Is not the light and life the substance?*

A. The light, is the same Jesus, in his first appearance, as the seed of light, not come forth to the perfect day. *G. Keith.*

Q. *If*

Q. *If then Jesus Christ in his first Appearance was at that time in the Jews, then those ordinances could not be shaddows of that: Of what then were they so?*

A. As Christ apprehending the weakness of his disciples, did think fit to leave them some figurative token, and mark of his remembrance for them to be in the practice of, till he was better known to them, mystically, and in the spirit, therefore he saidy Do this till I come. *W. Pen. Apol.* 134.

Q. *But were the Jewish ordinances figures only of Christ mystically, and in the Spirit?*

A. They were so;

Q. *Was not Christ known mystically and in the Spirit, at that time?*

A. Not as afterwards he would be;

Q. *If they were shaddows of something farther to be reveal'd, Whether that degree of light they then had, was not insufficient?*

A. There is a sufficiency in the least degree of light, to help, and save him that takes heed to it. *S. Fisher.*

Q. *Is not that which is able to save, the substance?*

A. It is so;

Q. *Are types, figures, shaddows, of force and to be observed when the substance is come?*

A. When the substance is come, the shaddow ceaseth in point of Institution. *W. Pen. Apol,* 134.

Q. *Were not those shaddows Instituted by God?*

A. They were so.

Q. *Were the Jews obliged to observe them?*

A. Yea,

Q. *Then Either the substance was not come, or they were no shaddows, or else they were ordain'd for some other end, and purpose: thus are you in a maze, and run your selves into Irreconcilable absurdities, and contradictions,*

dictions, pray, what was that doctrine which Christ seconded by Miracles.

A. That all men should take heed to him, the Light of them.

Q. *Forasmuch as all men acknowledge a light to be in every man, and that it ought to be heeded, what need was there of miracles to confirme this.*

A. But all men do not acknowledg the light in every man, to be the Christ of God.

Q. *Very true, were the Miracles then to prove this?*

A. Yea.

Q. *Where was such a doctrine delivered by Christ, and seconded by Miracles?*

A. Doth not Christ say, He is the light of men.

Q. *Where doth he say, The light in every man is the Christ of God?*

A. They who deny the light in every man to be the Christ, are Antichrists. *Ed. Bur.*

Q. *What farther did Christ deliver as his doctrine, which he seconded by Miracles?*

A. A message of a most free, universal tender of life to all that believe, and follow him the light in all his righteousness. *W. Pen.*

Q. *Was this all he seconded by miracles?*

A. Yea.

Q. *Dost thou do well to say so, since the Scriptures teach us otherwise?*

A. What other Doctrine did he confirm by miracles?

Q. *Was it not this, That he himself was the Messiah promised, and was sent into the world to dye for sinners, and is not this that doctrine you so Strenuously oppugn?*

A. Now

A. Now thou insinuates a slander against us.

Q. *What further did Christ do for the Salvation of men?*

A. He did ratifie and confirm all with great love, and a holy resignation by offering up his body to be crucified by wicked hands, and thereby became a most compleat captain, and perfect example. *W. Pen.*

Q. *Was Christ in his sufferings no more but an Example?*

A. What more, wouldst have him to be?

Q. *Was not the love of God, herein manifest, in sending his Son to dye for sinners?* Rom. 5.8.

A. There may be something of that in it.

Q. *How, and in what respect did Christ dye for sinners?*

A. Not to make satisfaction for their sins: the consequence of such a doctrine is both Irreligious, and Irrational *W. Pen. Sandy Found. p.* 16.

Q. *What doth the Scripture mean in saying, He was made sin for us?*

A. I caution and warn men, by no means to entertain this principle (*viz.*) of Christs Satisfaction by whomsoever recommended. O why should this Horrible thing be contended for by Christians? *W. Pen. ibid. p.* 16.25.30.

Q. *How was sin, laid on Christ, and how was he made a curse for us?*

A. God was satisfied in his Son Christ the anointed, the Lamb offer'd without spot a sacrifice for Sin. *G. W. Div. of Christ. p.*19.

Q. *In what respect was Christ a sacrifice for Sin?*

A. Your abuse of Christ, confusion, and darkness in stating your matter we cannot own, as proceeding from any sense or savour of Christ either as Sacrifice, or a Saviour, *G. W. ibid.* 79. 80.

Q. *Was that body of Jesus which was offer'd upon the cross the one, and onely, Sacrifice for Sin?*

A. Thy sottish queries riseth out of thy dark mind concerning the body of Jesus, as the Devill did about the body

of *Moses, Edward Burroughs.*

Q. Was Christs death a satisfactory Sacrifice, or not?

A. God satisfyed himself in his own gift, and without performing his own will he could not be satisfyed, *G. W. ibid.* 79.

Q. If thou hadst said, that God made man and gave him a reasonable Soul, &c. and without performing his own will he could not be satisfyed, would it not have been as much to the question, as what thou hast said: unswer me, Was Christs death on the Cross satisfactory for the sins of the world? or only for the Elect?

A. Thou Jesuit art pleading for a Christ a far off, that Christ did not satisfie for thee, thou art under the woe. The death of Christ we witness, *Edw. Bur.* Where reads thou that God requires satisfaction for the sins of the Elect, or laid any thing to their charge, thou blind ignorant Sot? *Edward Burroughs.*

Q. What was Christs end, in giving himself a ransome, in being a propitiation for the sins of the whole world?

A. To shew forth, and give testimony of Gods love, and grace towards all mankind, G. W.

Q. Wherein was that Love and Grace manifested in Christ being a sacrifice for all men?

A. He gave Him a ransome, to redeem, and purchase man out of the Transgression, G. W.

Q. Was it the will of God that Christ should dye to redeem man out of the Transgression?

A. It was so.

Q. Was there a necessity hereof?

A. God would not be satisfied without performing his own will, G. W.

Q. If it was Gods will, to give his Son to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world; And if there was a necessity that thus it should be, because (as you say) God cannot be satisfyed without doing his own will, How then can the meer

Light

Light within be sufficient to save? if it were, what necessity could there be of Christ being a sacrifice? but if this were necessary, then why do you maintain the former?

A. Now thou multiplies questions to ensnare.

Q. Pray be serious, and acquaint me what that obedience or suffering is by which you are reconciled to God?

A. Silence, flesh! Would thou who art an Enemy of God know how the Saints are reconciled to God? *Edw. Bur.*

Q. Will you not inform me in this matter?

A. Own the Light in thy conscience, and then thou shalt know. *Edwards Burroughs.*

Q. What think you of Justification by that Righteousness which Christ in his own person fulfilled for us, wholly without us?

A. I boldly affirm it to be a Doctrine of Devills. W. Pen.

Q. Is there no other Righteousness by which and for the sake of which the Saints are justified, than what Christ works in them?

A. Thou art accursed, thou Beast, upon whom the wrath of God must be accompliihed, who would have another Righteousness, than what Christ works in the Saints, *Edw. Burroughs.*

Q. Is there no such thing as an imputed righteousness?

A. Justification is not from the imputation of anothers righteousness, *W. Pen.*

Q. Doth God justifie men upon the account of their own works?

A. Was not *Abraham* justifyed by works? and was not his personal offering up of *Isaac* the ground of that just imputation? *W. Pen.*

Q. Are good works meritorious?

A. They may be said to procure, deserve, or obtain, *W. Pen.*

Q. Doth then the holy lives, and works, of the Saints justifie them in the sight of God, from the guilt of sin?

A. Thou dead beast, by the same that the Saints are justified, thou art condemn'd into the lake for ever, *Edw. Bur.*

Q. Are none justified or Righteous in the sight of God in whom is any corruption or failing?

A. Thou polluted Beast, God accepts not any, where there is any failing, or who do not fulfill the law, and answer every demand of justice, *Edw. Burroughs.*

Q. Who, what, is the true ministry?

A. God himself by his immediate power, Spirit, and unction within, is the teacher of his people, *G. Whitehead.*

Q. Who, or what doth he teach?

A. The Seed;

Q. Is the seed the onely object of this teaching?

A. To the mind which is carnal the commands of God are not given, nor can they be received, *Edw. Bur.*

Q. What is this seed?

A. 'Tis that of God in thee, the witness of God in thy conscience;

Q. Do not you sometimes call this seed Christ, and his Spirit?

A. We do.

Q. Is the command given only to, and obeyed by this Seed?

A. The Spirit both as a rul- manifests the promises, and exerciseth Faith, *G. W.*

Q. Is not this as much as to say, that God preacheth to, and is obeyed only by himself? Are you not ashamed to prate thus?

A. Is not the great work of the ministry to point to this (*viz.* the Seed) in them, *G. K?*

Q. Is it credible that God should teach only himself?

A. Thy dark mind cannot conceive these things.

Q. Dost thou thy self understand them?

A. Yea.

Q. Why wilt thou not endeavour to inform me?

A. What hast thou to do to talk of these things, thou knowest nothing of God and Christ.

Q. Do

Q. Do you not say, I have a light in me?

A. I do.

Q. What is this Light?

A. Thou art an Idle fellow, *thus one of their Ministers answered this question.*

Q. Must I obey this Light?

A. Yea.

Q. If I do obey it, will it certainly save me?

A. There is no doubt of that;

Q. What assurance may I have thereof?

A. If it do not, I dare be hang'd, R.W.

Q. Of what advantage will thy hanging be to me, if I should miscarry!

A. Now thou taunts.

Q. Dost thou not administer the occasion?

A. I see thou art still in the envious mind.

Q. Do you believe a state of Immmortality and eternal felicity?

A. We own, and witness to an Immortal state, Geo. W.

Q. Do you believe a farther happiness shall be injoy'd by the Saints, at the last day, than now?

A. When thinks thou that will bee? must all the Saints have their hopes, and faith of Salvation, unanswered till then? G. W. *Chr. Asc. p.* 34.

Q. Do not you wait for any thing farther?

A. Surely, death, and darkness hath power over thy mind, else thou would'st never shew thy self such an ignorant Papist, in putting Salvation so far off, till thou know'st not when, according to thy carnal conceits, G. W. *ibid.*

Q. Is eternal life, and felicity injoy'd now?

A. Is not the recompence of reward, Eternal life, and felicity, inwardly, and Spiritually received, by those that *Now* suffer for Christ, G. W. ibid. p. 37.

Q. Is your belief in these points consonant to the Doctrine delivered in the holy Scripture?

A. I have told thee that it is neceſſary for us to have things, reveal'd to us that are not to be found in the Scriptures, particularly not ſo much as by conſequence, *G. Keith.*

Q. Muſt we be concluded meerly by your ſayings and Imaginations?

A. We are of God, and they who withſtand our teſtimony are in the gall of bitterneſs. W. Pen. Such that interrogate us, we will tell them, they are Reprobates, and in the Sorcery and Witchcraft, Enemies to the life, that they are filthy polluted Beaſts; Serpents, querying with conjured words, and that they are blind, and ignorant Sots, *Edw. Bur.*

Q. Is what you ſay concerning ſuch, certainly true?

A. The Judgment we paſſe upon them, they ſhall eternally Witneſs, *Edw. Burroughs.*

Q. If ſuch as Edw. Burroughs, George Whitehead, *and* W. Pen. *may be accounted true Miniſters, whom ſhall we eſteem falſe?*

A. They who ſay the Scriptures are the rule, that deny Chriſt to be the Light in every man.

Q. Doth not your Miniſtry, deny Chriſts Perſon, maintain juſtification by works, and that not according to the tenour of the ſecond, but of the firſt covenant? curſing people for doing what they bid them; Impoſe on us the groſſeſt falſhoods, and moſt irreconcileable contradictions, under the pretence of immediate Inſpirations, as if it were not enough for them to be wicked alone, unleſſe they could make God himſelf (O Horrid villany!) an acceſſory with them? A ſort of men, that will affirm, and deny at pleaſure: One while ſay, they own the Perſon of Chriſt; Another while, deny he hath any perſonal being without men: Now they will confeſſe the very Chriſt who dyed at Jeruſalem; *anon they tell us, that Chriſt was but a figure, a ſhaddow paſſed away, and why ſhould we trouble our ſelves with that Jeſus, and, To concern our ſelves about his ſecond perſonal Coming is but puz'ling about ſilly and fooliſh things. When they ſay Chriſt came to redeem man; If*

we

we sift their meaning, 'tis nothing but the Seed, the principle of God in man that wants redemption.

If we tell them of their faults they aggravate them, by persisting therein, and whil st they rail at their accusers, justifie the Accusation it self, as is the manner of your Dictator Will. Pen. *who of late hath been so extravagant in his writings, that scarce a man that reads him but thinks him to be either distracted or worse, and yet must we believe such as these are true Ministers?*

A. Why speakest thou so severely against W. Pen?

Q. Have I not sufficient reason?

I profess, were I, as he, I would sue thee at the Common-Law, *thus an eminent Quaker spoke to a friend of mine.*

Q. Why so?

A. Because thou hast disparaged him.

Q. Hath W. Pen *a dispensation to write or speak without controul, Is he a Universal Dictator?*

A. I would have him seek his remedy against thee at the Common-Law;

Q. Would such a practice, agree with your principle of Liberty of Conscience?

A. Liberty to reflect on such as W. Pen, is not to be allow'd: no Liberty but in the Power, *G. Fox.*

Q. You take a Liberty to curse, and revile others, who give you no just cause. And may not we take notice when, or wherein you err, and soberly put you in mind thereof?

A. What we do is nothing to thee, we are in the Power; we know we are of God, therefore all that withstand our testimony are in the gall of bitterness, W. Pen.

Q. If now under your present circumstances, you manifest such a mind; what might we expect from you, were your Power answerable to your Wills?

A. Alas for thee! we are an innocent people.

Q. We have nothing but your own words for it; your envenom'd malice against others, your Tyrannical actings amongst

mongst your selves, gives us sufficient intimations, that it will be dangerous trusting the Old man in you.

A further account of you, and your Tenets, you may expect as opportunity and occasion is offered: as yet I have mostly been concerned about your opinions, and have been sparing touching your practices, which is not for want of Instances, for I do give you to understand, That as Horrid enormities are reigning under the vizor and garb of a Quaker, as amongst any other sort of men; only with this difference, Yours are more Aggravated, by your pretences to perfection, which pretence is no more than a meer fraud, whereby you deceive many simple people. If therefore you will provoke me to speak all I can, either respecting your opinions, or practices, blame not me, but thank your selves if the event answer not your expectation.

The End.

Errata.

PAg. 13. lin. 16. for salvation, r. saluration, p. 26. l. 6. dele Christ, l. 7. r. Christ, p. 68. l. 32. for at r. act, p. 79. l. 18. for sufficient, r. insufficient.